

*Printed for the AUTHOR, and sold by the Book-  
sellers of London and Westminster, 1731.*



SHORT HISTORY

OF THE

ROYAL SUCCESSION

AND THE

ROYAL WEDDINGS

BY

JOHN R. MITCHELL

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS BY

JOHN R. MITCHELL





30 Jan. 1730.

TO ALL THE  
TRUE SONS  
OF THE  
*Church of England.*

**T**H O' I have a great aversion to the  
fulsome flatteries, and other imper-  
tinences, which, by our fashionable  
writers, are oftentimes soisted in be-  
tween their title-page and book (as if they  
wanted somewhat of a foil, to make their fol-  
lowing pages appear the brighter); yet I'm  
not so far prejudic'd against prefaces and dedi-  
cations, as to deny them to be many times  
useful, sometimes necessary. And therefore,  
whilst I thought there was no necessity for ei-  
ther, I ventur'd into the world, without pa-  
tron, without apology: (And who would not  
have perswaded himself, as I did, that a faith-

#### iv The DEDICATION.

ful extract out of the holy scriptures might have been sufficiently protected, as well as warranted, by their divine authority?) But, since I have had full experience, that the best cause is not always the most favourably heard, and that even those of God and the King have oftentimes the most adversaries in this world, I thought it high time, to bethink my self of some patron, under whose wing I might find encouragement and protection.

And where can I so reasonably presume upon a defence against the impertinent cavils, the groundless criticisms, and the odious reflections, of the open and secret enemies of the church and monarchy, as from you, whose common concern this is? For as the rights of the Church can't be violated, but your religion (or, at least, the exercise of it) will become precarious: so neither can those of the Crown be invaded, without involving every private subject (and more especially you, who by principle are the most inviolably attach'd thereto) in the common calamity. For, such hath formerly been (and I hope still may be) the characteristick of that church, of which we are members, that it ' hath stood unshaken in its  
' loyalty among all the storms of fury, and  
' paroxysms of madness, which have seized our  
nation.

## The DEDICATION. V

' nation. For neither the rage of the heathen,  
 ' nor madness of the people, that imagined a  
 ' vain thing; not the fears and rumours of in-  
 ' novations in religion, drest up with all the  
 ' amazing circumstances of horror; not se-  
 ' cret underminings, and open batteries; not  
 ' the force of threatening, nor power of per-  
 ' swasion; nor all other stratagems of rebelli-  
 ' ous minds, could ever draw off one true son  
 ' of the church from his allegiance and loyal-  
 ' ty: loyalty being the badge of the church  
 ' and clergy of *England*; and there being no  
 ' truer *Shibboleth*, to distinguish her true sons,  
 ' from those that are spurious and pretended  
 ' ones (a)'.

And

(a) *Heyrick's* serm. 26 *Jul.* 1685, p. 10, 11. The fa-  
 mous Dr. *Ezek. Hopkins* (in his serm. 31 *Jan.* 1669, p. 36.  
 37, in 4to.) says, ' It was once the glory of the *Protestant* re-  
 ' ligion, that it taught subjects to account the persons of their  
 ' princes sacred and inviolable; supream to all under God,  
 ' and accountable to none but him——: but now our adver-  
 ' saries triumph in the shame of our profession, when the most  
 ' notorious regicides, who not only avow the doctrine, but  
 ' publicly perpetrate the fact, of deposing and killing a  
 ' King, are found among those who pretended to be at the  
 ' greatest distance from *Romish* principles and practices'.  
 And Dr. *Sherlock* (in a vindicat. of his serm. 29 *May*, 1685,  
 p. 25.) speaking of the *Bill of Exclusion*, says, ' If ever the  
 ' loyalty of the church of *England* was tried, it was in that  
 ' affair, which she had no other interest, but a sense of duty,  
 ' to oblige her to; and I know not any one man, who was  
 ' firm and stedfast to the church, but was so to the successi-  
 ' on too; tho' he underwent the imputation of being a *Pa-*  
pist,



## vi The DEDICATION.

And yet, it is not your concern alone, but that of every *English* subject. For, since, as hath been lately well observ'd, the king ' has ' at least the same right with every private ' person, and a much greater right, as he sustains the person and fortunes of every private ' man in that community (a) ', it follows, that, whenever the *rights* of the King are injuriously attempted, those of *every private subject* must needs be sensibly affected; and consequently, *every private subject* in the community ought to interest himself therein, and make it his own case. But, that this is even our indispensable duty, we have also the express authority and evidence of our blessed favour: who, in what he says relating to himself, plainly intimates, that, whenever a King's person, or rights are in danger, from either the hands, pens, or tongues of his enemies, it is the duty of all his subjects to assist him, by all manner of ways; yea even, if occasion requires it, to *fight, that he should not be delivered to his Jewish (b) enemies.*

' This,

' *first, or possibly inclined for it.* And Dr. Will. King (of Dublin) in a letter prefix'd to Bp. Sheridan's serm. 22 Mar. 1684, says, ' It is impossible any one of our communion ' should be disloyal, without renouncing his religion '.

(a) Sermon at Worcester. 7 June, 1716, by E. Chandler, D D. &c p. 11. (b) St. John xviii. 36.

## The DEDICATION. vii

‘ This, my brethren, (*to use the words of a late eminent prelate*) is not only the best, but the only true cause of God in this world, for which all subjects are bound in conscience to fight; the cause of their lawful sovereign, that which he authorizes, either by his person, or his commission, or his (*a*) allowance’.

The fatal consequences of the neglect of this duty, in the beginning of the troubles of our *Royal Martyr*, (whom we this day commemorate) argue strongly also, from our own experience, as *Englishmen*, against the like negligence, whenever it pleases God almighty, for our national sins, to afflict us with the like national judgments.

For, then, our undoubted lawful sovereign was, by his natural-born and sworn subjects, resisted, imprison’d, depos’d, and murder’d: his son, and undoubted heir, first driven into *Popish* countries, for protection and subsistence; and then, under a charge of *Popery*, &c. renounc’d, attainted, abjur’d, and a price (much greater than *thirty pieces of silver*!) set upon his head (who nevertheless was the head of the whole commonwealth;) tho’ in truth, if he had been a *Papist* indeed, (as certain authors of

(a) *Sprat’s* serm. 20 Apr. 1682, p. 13, 8vo.

## viii The DEDICATION.

of great name do affirm he was,) it had been his misfortune only, but their own fault.

For (as a late eminent divine observ'd) those *rebels*, ' by banishing the royal family, cast  
' them into the very jaws of Popery and seduction, and not only *led*, but drove them,  
' *into temptation*'. Upon which he expostulates thus; ' And now will these fellows plunge  
' men over head and ears in a ditch, and then  
' knock out their brains, for having a spot  
' upon their clothes? kindle a flame round about them, and then, with tragical outcries,  
' reproach them for being singed? do all that  
' they can, compassing even sea and land, to  
' make a profelyte to Popery, and then strip  
' him of his inheritance for being so? O! the  
' equity, reason, and humanity of a *true Protestant*, *fanatick* zeal! much according to  
' the *devil's* method; first to draw men to  
' sin, and then to damn and destroy them for  
' it (*a*)!'

But further; the bishops and clergy, who adher'd to the ancient and orthodox doctrines of the church of *England*, were turn'd out of their freeholds by pretended acts, or ordinances, of a rebel-parliament: and others (after the order of *Jeroboam*!) treasonably and schismatically

(a) Dr. South's serm. vol. vi. p. 27, 28.

## The DEDICATION. ix

tically brought upon the stage, to act the parts of kings and priests, in the respective offices of the church and kingdom of *Christ*! our ancestors, the true churchmen and loyal subjects, were forc'd to retire into *upper rooms*, for communion, and to *shut the doors*, (as their exemplars, the primitive *Christians*, did, in the time of the like persecutions,) *for fear of the* (a) *Jews*; there privately to pray unto that God, who *seeth in* (b) *secret*, and hath promised, that *where two or three are gathered together in his name, and with one accord*, (in how private or obscure a place soever) *there he will be in the midst of* (c) *them*: and even the good King himself, for want of his *orthodox* clergy, was, during his confinement, forc'd to be his *own chaplain* in his bed-chamber, (where he constantly (d) used the common-prayer himself,) rather than join with the intruded schismaticks; while the pulpits and parish churches were open to every body, but such only as had the right and lawful call to them! then, as a faithful and conscientious adherence to the lawful King was accounted *high treason*; so to serve God, according to

a his

(a) *St. John* xx. 19. *Acts* i. 13. The reader may see a full state of their case, in the preface to *Mason's vindicar.* of the Ch. of *Engl.* 1728, fol. lxx. (b) *St. Mat.* vi. 6, 18. (c) — xviii. 18, 19. *Acts* i. 14. — ii. 1, 46. (d) *Clarend. hist. rebell.* vol. iii, p. 39.



## X The DEDICATION.

his own institution, was reckon'd an *high crime and misdemeanour*! for in such times  
 ' a man may be thought a rebel for recom-  
 ' mending loyalty, or seditious for preaching  
 ' against (a) sedition'! In a word, the best  
 subjects, purely for their *loyalty* to their exil'd  
 sovereign, were punish'd as *rebels* by open  
 rebels, and for their *orthodoxy*, as *schismatics*  
 by notorious schismatics: under pretence of  
 which false charges, they were frequently pur-  
 sued to death, (and consequently (b) crown'd  
 with martyrdom) or bury'd above ground; or,  
 at least, by merciless fines, sequestrations and  
 compositions, generally reduc'd to rags and  
 penury, for the sake of a good conscience,  
 ' many thousands of them having quitted all  
 ' they had in the world, *endured a great fight*  
 ' *of afflictions, took joyfully the spoiling of*  
 ' *their goods, had tryal of cruel mockings, yea*  
 ' *more-*

(a) Dr. Sachev. speech, in his trial, p. 244. (b) The  
 learned bishop Morley (in his answ. to Father Cressley, p. 9)  
 affirms, that *Obedience to our sovereign is a part of our religi-*  
*on*; ' and we think him as much a *Martyr*, that dies in de-  
 ' fence of the fifth, or any other of the ten Command-  
 ' ments, as he that dies in defence of any of the Arti-  
 ' cles of the Creed': and yet (as another well observes)  
 ' men of soft and smooth insinuations would introduce a  
 ' principle of *self-preservation* (as they call it,) as if it were  
 ' unworthy, as if it were unlawful, to suffer any thing like  
 ' *Martyrdom*; nay, as if it were more *Christian* to be re-  
 ' bels and regicides, than to be so much as *Confessors* in the  
 ' cause of *Christ*'. Turner's serm. 9. Sept. 1683, p. 26, 27.

## The DEDICATION. xi

‘ moreover, of bonds and imprisonments, and  
 ‘ wandered about, being (a) destitute, to pre-  
 ‘ serve inviolable their fidelity to the King and  
 ‘ the (b) church ’; while the *usurpers*, and their  
 adherents, by the means of unwarrantable (c)  
 compliances, *received their good things* in this  
 life, being clothed in purple and fine linnen,  
 and faring sumptuously every (d) day; and  
 ‘ mean and ignoble persons trampled upon  
 ‘ crowns and mitres, enriched themselves with  
 ‘ the spoils of church and state, usurped the  
 ‘ royal power, but governed like (e) slaves ’!  
 so that ‘ every good man ought to be very  
 ‘ careful, at least in this *our day*, that he do  
 ‘ not herd or concur with those spirits, which  
 ‘ but the other day (as it were) to shut out all  
 a 2 ‘ arbitrary

(a) *Hebr.* x. 32, &c — xi. 36, &c. (b) *Walker's* suff. clergy, pref. fol. v. (c) ‘ The *Gnosticks*, in the primitive church — held it lawful to apostatize in time of danger, and comply with the *Jews* for fear of persecution: but, when the days of vengeance and visitation came, God makes a distinction between those carnal pretenders, and such as continued stedfast to the profession of his truth. He provides a *Pella* for the *Christians*, a hiding-place for them, to retire to, — but leaves those abominable *Hereticks* to be destroyed with the crucifiers of *Christ*, and hypocrites to perish with unbelievers: and this is said by some to be the accomplishment of that prediction of our Saviour, *He that will save his life shall lose it*, when the *Gnosticks*, who by their compliances expected shelter among the *Jews*, were together with them so signally involved in the same ruin’. *Dr. Fane's* serm. 11 *Apr.* 1679, p. 39. (d) *St. Luke* xvi. 19, &c. (e) *Dr. Sherl.* serm. 29 *May*, 1685, p. 25.

## xii The DEDICATION.

‘ arbitrary power brought it in, and to prevent Popery laid aside all true religion, and the fear of (a) God ’.

To bring all which about, those audacious rebels began first with jealousies and fears (as they pretended) of *Popery*; which they falsely and maliciously insinuated against the best King, and one of the best archbishops, that the best of churches was ever bless'd with. *Falsly*, I say, to shew their malice: tho', if the King had indeed been of that church, it would not have follow'd, (as such sophisters would infer) that our church must have been ruin'd; since ‘ we might have a freedom of religion under a Popish government, and a Popish direction (b) ’. For proof of which we need but to take an unprejudic'd view of the religion and ecclesiastical government here maintain'd amongst us, after the restoration of king *Charles II.* who, we are positively told, was ‘ perverted in his religion abroad, and came over (as hath since very plainly appear'd,) with a design and resolution to establish Popery in these (c) kingdoms ’.

And

(a) Dr. *Edw. Pelling's* serm. 5 Nov. 1683, p. 34. (b) B. *Hoadly's* serm. at *Hertsf.* 22 Mar. 1707, p. 11, in 8vo. (c) Bp. *Gibson's* four sermons 1719, p. 85. and Bp. *Fleetw.* 7 June, 1716, p. 14. See a fair state of the succession of bishops, in that and the following reign, in the pref. to *Mason's* vindicat. of the ch. of *England*, 1728, fol. lxxx, lxxxi.

## The DEDICATION. xiii

And besides, 'tis certain, ' No prince can  
 ' take our religion from us, if we resolve to  
 ' keep (a) it: — Men may keep their religi-  
 ' on, if they please, in despite of earthly pow-  
 ' ers; and therefore no powers can hurt reli-  
 ' gion, though they may persecute the pro-  
 ' fessors of it: and therefore, when men take  
 ' up arms to avoid persecution, it is not in  
 ' defence of religion, but of themselves, that  
 ' is, to avoid their suffering for (b) religion'.  
 But, above all, as we have God's repeated  
 promises to take care of his church in all its  
 dangers, there is nothing for us to do, but to  
 use lawful means only, for its security, and  
 trust in him for the effect: for ' a good cause  
 ' seldom needs to be supported by wicked  
 ' means; or, if it should, yet a good man  
 ' would rather leave his cause to God's pro-  
 ' vidence, and let it suffer, than venture to  
 ' sin against God and his own soul, for the  
 ' sake of (c) it'. Whereas the contrary pro-  
 cedure, of reviling, resisting, imprisoning, de-  
 posing, murdering or banishing, God's lawful  
 vicegerent, under the specious pretence of se-  
 curing religion, is condemn'd by all true  
*English-*

(a) Dr. *Sherl.* serm. 29 *May*, 1692, p. 27. (b) — Case  
 of resist. p. 61. (c) Bp. *Wake's* serm. 2 *Apr.* 1710, p. 23.  
 in 8vo.



## xiv The DEDICATION.

*Englishmen*, all true *Protestants*, all true *Christians*. For 'tho' the maintenance of religion is commonly made the most plausible pretence for rebellion (as it was for the last among us, and has been made use of since, towards the encouraging of another,) yet rebellion almost constantly proves (as that last prov'd) the means to destroy (*a*) religion'. And how should it be otherwise, when it is no better, than applying to the devil (*b*) for help in God's cause, and acting upon the principles of those who hold it lawful to *do evil that good may come?* of whom an inspired Apostle has declar'd, that their *damnation is* (*c*) *just*, 'from which no *Machiavel* can preserve us, nor any policy of state procure a (*d*) dispensation'!

However, thus our pretended patriots acted! for which they are branded with the character of *Fanaticks* and *miscreants*, and declar'd

(*a*) Bp. Turner's serm. 23 Apr. 1685, p. 19. (*b*) *Treason in Protestants* 'is like the *Italian* distemper: it was first brought from another country, and is no way natural to our own, tho' the infection has been taken by too many, who had an ill temper prepared for it; and others, if they take not care, are liable to catch it by the lewdness of ambition, revenge or discontent'. *W. Payne's* serm. 9 Sept. 1683, p. 20. (*c*) *Rom.* iii. 8. See also *Dr. Bradford's* serm. 5 Nov. 1696. *Mr. Milbourn's* 30 Jan. 1716. and *Mr. Kettlewell's* works, vol. ii, fol. 33 and 74. (*d*) Bp. Griff. *Williams's* rights of kings, &c. fol. 16.

## The DEDICATION. XV

declar'd to have been 'as far from being true  
 ' Protestants, as they were from being true  
 ' (a) subjects'! And having succeeded so far  
 as to instill that groundless apprehension of  
*Popery* into the too credulous mob, they easily  
 possess'd them with the danger of *Tyranny*  
 and *Arbitrary Power*, as the necessary and  
 (b) unavoidable consequence of the other: as  
 if our ancestors had all been *Slaves* under the  
*Popish* Kings, before the Reformation! where-  
 as, to speak the truth, our *Magna Charta*,  
 and many other of the best of our privileges,  
 which are the peculiar glory and happiness of  
*Old England*, (and for which the liberties of  
*Englishmen* have been the envy of all other  
 nations,) were granted in those times. And  
 yet, how untruly, how unjustly applied, and  
 how absurd soever these suggestions were in  
 themselves, they were taken for granted  
 then, and so did naturally help forward the  
 downfall

(a) Stat. xii. Car. II. c. 30. (b) We are assured, even  
 in the reign of the *Popish* Queen *Mary*, that when a scheme  
 was laid before her, proposing to make her absolute and  
 arbitrary, so that she might rule according to her pleasure,  
 she disliked it, and consulted Gardiner upon it, who declaring  
 it to be a pernicious device of subtil Sycophants, and horrible to  
 be thought on, the Queen thank'd him, and threw the book  
 into the fire, charging those about her, never to receive more  
 such projects: Dr. Burn. hist. reform. vol. ii, 1681, fol.  
 278.

## xvi The DEDICATION.

downfal of the crown, and the fin of this day: tho', if they had been true, 'tis a certain rule, that 'no jealousies or fears, no threatening dangers, can justify any unwarrantable means of our preservation, or make us forget our duty to God and the (a) King;— and even the *Lion's mouth* itself, opening to devour us, can never excuse us from our obligation to submit and suffer, if God had so ordered it by his providence, that we — were born under one that would deliver us up to the (b) *Lion*!'

Their next business was, by a multitude of seditious pamphlets and sermons, (for *Rebels never wanted* (c) *writers to maintain their unjust actions*;) to prejudice the unthinking multitude against the government both in church and state, as usurpations upon the liberties of the *Free-born People*, (forsooth!) and to persuade them to exert themselves, in order to the recovery of their pretended native freedom. As if a *man was born* into the world, *like a wild ass's* (d) *colt*! tho' 'tis plain to a demonstration, from the following history, that no man ever was born free from govern-

(a) Mr. Sam. Adams's serm. upon rebell. 1716, p. 24.  
(b) Dr. Burvet's serm. 5 Nov. 1684, p. 27. (c) Papers betw. K. Cha. I. and Mr. Henderson, 1646, (printed 1649, in 8vo.) p. 38. (d) *Job* xi. 12.

## The DEDICATION. xvii

government, or ever can be so, unless when a sovereign prince happens to be born after the death of his (a) father.

And, the better to bring this about, they impudently asserted, and demurely quoted the holy (b) scriptures, as if they could have found

b

evidence

(a) The learned Bp. *Morton*, having observ'd, that the King, with respect to his subjects, is like a father with respect to his children, says of the latter, ' If he do injuriously intreat any of them, or not carefully keep his own goods, or live any way disorderly, it is the duty of his children, if not with silence to suffer it, yet with great modesty to admonish him of it: but if they should join themselves together, and offer any violence unto him; especially, if they should throw him out of his house, all men would count them rebellious and ungracious children: but if they should take his life from him, they were to be esteem'd notoriously wicked; yea, rather as monsters, worthy to be abhorred of all men '. *Salomon* 1596, p. 19.

(b) ' It is the unhappy fate of the holy scriptures, to be abused into a kind of publick armory, whence the several contending parties — fetch weapons to arm themselves, and fight each other —. We find it practis'd — by the grand impostor of the world —: and *Satan* has always had, and still has, his agents and emissaries, that use the same devilish policy. This they were at in *Forty two*: and — the same evil spirit is conjur'd up again —; there being men found in our days, who, tho' in open and actual rebellion —, *appeal to heaven for the justice of their arms*, &c. *C. Hutton's* serm. 26 *July*, 1685, p. 1, 2. — ' They go to the scripture, not to learn from thence, what or whose opinions are truest, but how they may best defend their own ': *Dr. Hare's* serm. 5 *May*, 1719, edit. 2, p. 11. And another (whose knowledge of what he wrote about cannot be disputed,) gives a plain reason for all this, because ' Hypocrisy, as all other things that we wear, is capable of new fashions; and the skill of those who use it, is to find out that which is most likely to take, and to suit it with the present occasion '! Bp. *Burnet's* serm. at the coronat. of *K. W.* and *Q. M.* 11 *Apr.* 1689, p. 18.



## xviii The DEDICATION.

evidence in the word of God against his own institutions!) that neither the regal, nor episcopal power had any ground or foundation in the sacred records; but that all power, ecclesiastical as well as civil, was radically, or originally, in the people, and therefore but a trust, which the trustees must be accountable for to them; and consequently, that the people might justly deprive the one, and depose the other (yea, and put them both to death) when ever, they thought, the publick good might be advanc'd thereby.

Neither were they less notorious for their false glosses upon the laws, and fundamental constitution of our own country: where they audaciously insisted, (as their *Observers*, and *Reviews*, and other wretched hirelings, have done in our days,) that the *King is one of the three estates*, and therefore but co-ordinate with, not supreme over, the rest; and consequently, if the Lords and Commons join against the Crown, they have the authority of two to one against him, and may therefore lawfully controul and over-rule him! Notwithstanding it is manifestly evident (a) from the  
parlia-

(a) In these we read of such and such things, done *by the authority of the King, with the assent of the Three Estates*: and find the Lords Spiritual, the Lords Temporal, and the Com-

## The DEDICATION. xix

parliament-rolls, and other publick records, that the three estates are the *Lords Spiritual*, the *Lords Temporal*, and the *Commons*: and that the King is the head of, and supreme over them all; by whose *fiat* alone their actions become valid, and without which all their counsels and deliberations have no manner of authority to bind their fellowsubjects.

‘ Many other doctrines there are which bear  
‘ affinity with these, and which of late have

b 2

‘ serv’d

Commons, declaring, of themselves together in a body, that *they do represent in parliament the Three Estates of the realm*; and at the same time professing themselves, as such, to be (as indeed they cannot pretend to be any more, than) *his Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects*; of which I cou'd fill the margin with a multitude of incontestable proofs, ancient and modern. But a man who is not a meer stranger even to the *English* statute-book can have no more ground to dispute the truth of this, than he can have to doubt whether it is day-light, when he sees the sun shining in his *meridian* splendor. However, for the unlearned reader's satisfaction, I shall refer him only to the office for the *fifth of Nov.* in the Common prayer book, (which is confirm'd by several acts of parliament, and is, or ought to be, well known in every good family :) where he will find it entitl'd *A form of prayer with thanksgiving — for the happy deliverance of K. James I. and the Three Estates of England, &c.* and in the collect before the epistle, we address our selves unto God in the same terms, with due acknowledgments for his *preserving the King and the Three Estates*. And, to shew, that this doctrine is not chang'd with the times, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons which assembled in the convention, 1688, were so far from reckoning the King one of the Three Estates, that they declar'd themselves to *represent all the estates of the people of this realm*, even when they neither had any King among them, nor were assembled by any King's writ.

## xx The DEDICATION.

‘ serv’d to fill up a *Leviathan*, a *Plato Redi-*  
 ‘ *virus* —, and other scandalous writings,  
 ‘ wherewith the world is even now pester’d;  
 ‘ as if it were not enough to have intoxicated  
 ‘ the people, to have undone a nation, and to  
 ‘ have pulled down the crown once! for these  
 ‘ were the principles, upon which those deli-  
 ‘ cate *Protestants*, those *tender* and thin-  
 ‘ skin’d *consciences*, those goodly *loyal* and  
 ‘ *dutiful subjects* acted; when they fought  
 ‘ against their King; when they *hunted* him  
 ‘ upon the *mountains*; when they gave him  
 ‘ a *crown of thorns* for a diadem of gold——.  
 ‘ And yet these principles were once the pro-  
 ‘ per creed of the (a) *Jesuites*’! And indeed  
 there is ample testimony from authors of great  
 (b) credit, how far the politicks of the court  
 of

(a) Dr. Edw. Pelling’s serm. 30 Jan. 1681, p. 13. (b)  
 See the letters from Sr. W. Boswell, and Andr. ab Habern-  
 field to Arbp. Laud, and from Bp. Bramhall to Arbp Usher,  
 printed in the little books entituled *Foxes* and *Firebrands*  
 1682, and in several others: Upon which and the like au-  
 thorities, we need not to wonder, when we find that some  
 of those who make the loudest outcries of Popery, have  
 been Papists themselves in disguise. And what a harmony  
 and concert there has been all along ‘between the *Papists* and  
*Fanaticks*, in their oppositions to our establish’d govern-  
 ment, the reader may see in a *parallel* drawn up by Mr.  
*Jenner*, in his *prerog. of primog.* 1685, p. 155 &c. And  
 in particular, when Popery seem’d to be in a flourishing  
 state, ’tis remark’d by an ingenious author, how generally,  
 and almost universally, the Dissenters of all kinds affected to  
 stile them *Our Brethren the Roman-Catholicks*! Dr. Swift’s  
*Miscell.* 1713, p. 112.

## The DEDICATION. XXI

of *Rome* had prevail'd with many of that communion to increase our dissensions, by promoting such factions and schisms amongst us, as (they foresaw) in time would overturn our happy constitution, both in church and state; in hopes, that when once the only firm bulwark against Popery was overthrown, such a revolution would open a door for that religion once more to enter in at. In order to which, 'as they had heighten'd and fomented the  
'misunderstanding and divisions between the  
'King and people at first; so divers of them,  
'under a *puritanical* disguise, were list'd  
'with the parliament forces, and did, through  
'the course of the war, secretly blow the  
'flames, and push on our ruin and confusion;  
'they having had it resolv'd in a consult, that  
'it was lawful to put the King to (a) death'.

I have not room here, neither is it my intention, to enlarge upon the many various disguises which were put on by the incendiaries, as best suited their particular views and interests: nor shall I trespass upon my own time, or my readers patience, by ent'ring into a long detail of their proceedings; to shew how widely different their actions were from their hypocritical professions, with which they  
had

(a) Bp. Moore's serm. 31 Jan. 1697, p. 30, 31.



## xxii The DEDICATION.

had captivated the people. 'Tis enough for me here to point to some (a) of those many authors, who have given a large and lively description of the whole: but I presume upon the reader's pardon, while I give him a taste of such entertainment, as he must expect to meet with in the perusal of more voluminous works.

As to their reformation of religion, it was *root and branch*: the chaste *spouse* of *Christ*, the true old orthodox church was defil'd and polluted at the will of every bold and licentious invader; and instead of sound doctrine nothing substituted but time-serving nonsense, cant, profaneness, and blasphemy! the boasted liberty of the subjects was render'd precarious by their own representatives; who, at the same time that they amus'd the people with jealousies and apprehensions of tyranny and oppression from their lawful and gracious sovereign, assum'd to themselves an unpresumed arbitrary power of taking into custody their fellow-subjects, for matters no ways relating to the stated privileges of parliament!

and

(a) I would particularly recommend the *Earl of Clarendon's* history of the Rebellion: and, after a careful perusal of that, *Walker's* *Sufferings* of the Clergy; as the best fund to secure a sufficient stock of knowledge of the true state of those times, and the spirit of the party.

## The DEDICATION. xxiii

and the property of every honest *Englishman*, (yea, and his life too) was liable to be taken away, without cause, without legal trial, and contrary to all law, at the pleasure of every upstart Committee-man, or upon the malicious suggestion of every spiteful and perjur'd informer! But indeed, since they 'were permitted by the just judgment of God, for the 'punishment of the many crying sins of this 'nation, to usurp a power to which they had 'not the least colour or pretence of right': 'tis no wonder, that they did (as all Usurpers in general do) 'exercise it in a more cruel, arbitrary, and tyrannical manner, than was 'ever done by any of our rightful and lawful '(a) princes'. In short (to use the words of an eminent preacher, who knew the men and their manners,) --- 'If to render the service of 'God ridiculous and contemptible; if to play 'the hypocrites, and to violate oaths, and by 'all instances of wickedness to bring a reproach 'and *odium* upon Christianity: if such religious villanies as these did speak men to be 'the true friends and patrons of religion, I 'am sure no age of the church ever produced 'such friends and patrons before; though I  
' cannot

## xxiv The DEDICATION.

‘ cannot undertake but this age possibly may  
 ‘ produce the (a) like ’.

Another plausible colour, which they gave their cause, was, that their principal aim was not against the King himself, but only to take him out of the hands of his *evil counsellors*; whereas, in fact, his counsellors in general (except two or three of the best) were left unmolested, and *the King's person only* (b) *hunted*. But a venerable prelate of those times, assures us of their perfidy, upon his own sufficient experience; ‘ I am sure, (says he) I am  
 ‘ able to arise in the last day, to testify against  
 ‘ many of his enemies and accusers, that I  
 ‘ have often heard them justifying him in  
 ‘ those things, for which afterwards they ac-  
 ‘ cused him and condemn'd him; yea, they  
 ‘ were his counsellors to have them done, and  
 ‘ then his prosecutors, and persecutors of him  
 ‘ unto the death, for doing (c) them ’. So that a late reverend and learned divine might well say of that party, that they ‘ are general-  
 ‘ ly known by this character, that they are  
 ‘ for the King against his evil counsellors, and  
 ‘ for

(a) Dr. Edw. Pelling's serm. 30 Jan. 1681, p. 28. (b) Dr. Heylin's life of Abp. Laud, 1668, fol. 522. (c) Bp. Griff. Williams's declar. of God's judgm. 1661, fol 2.

## The DEDICATION. XXV

‘ for the *Protestant* religion against the (a)  
‘ church’!

But the true secret of all was plainly to make a breach and interruption (b) in our succession of Kings as well as of bishops; in consequence of which the *Fanaticks* projected a schism in the church, and a commonwealth (as they call it) in the state: which the more cunning *Jesuits* heartily encourag’d; well knowing that in such times of confusion they shou’d have the better opportunity to pick up the wand’ring flock, when once gone astray, and to seduce them again to their pretended mother-church!

Yet still the principles of the party were so wild and romantick, so manifestly contrary to  
c scrip-

(a) Dr. *Hickes’s* serm. at *Worcester*. 29 May, 1684. dedicar. p. 2. (b) I remember to have read of some memoirs of *St. John Dingley*, secretary to the Prince and Princess *Palatine* (sometime call’d King and Queen of *Bohemia*;) wherein it appears, that these rebels, by several agents, tempted that unfortunate Princess, under pretence of the fears of Popery, to take part with them, against her own father King *James* and her brother King *Charles*, successively, insinuating that they would settle the crown upon her and her children: But she had more grace than to hearken to their diabolical suggestions, and gave them an answer worthy of her high birth; plainly foreseeing, that their real design was to destroy the whole Royal Family, by setting up one branch of them against another: Neither did the Prince, her husband, give them any more encouragement in their opposition to Episcopacy, tho’ he had not establish’d it in his own *German* dominions.



## xxvi The DEDICATION.

scripture, history, law, reason, and even to common sense too, that many well-meaning people, and among the rest the good King himself, (whose credulity and hereditary clemency were his greatest, if not his only faults) would not be perswaded to suspect the loyalty, or sense of the people of *England*, so far as to apprehend any danger therefrom. But alas! (so little assurance is there of the affections of the giddy multitude, that) when it was too late to rectify it, they were all convinc'd of their mistake: insomuch, that when the King issued his *declaration*, in *answer* to that of the 5th of *May*, 1642, concerning the *Militia*, he attributed the chief cause of all those troubles, to those very *pamphlets* and *papers*, which he had before thought *below the high and royal dignity, wherein God had placed him to take notice of*. And therein his Majesty complain'd, that ' whilst the  
' presses swarmed with, and every day pro-  
' duced new tracts against the establish'd go-  
' vernment of the church and state, most men  
' wanted the courage or the conscience to  
' write, or the opportunity and encourage-  
' ment to publish such composed sober anim-  
' adversions, as might either preserve the  
' minds of his good subjects from such infecti-  
on,

## The DEDICATION. XXVII

‘ on, or restore and recover them, when they  
‘ were so infected (a)’.

Agreeable to which, the great council of  
the nation, in a lawful parliament assembled,  
upon the resettlement of the government after  
the happy restoration of the son and heir of  
the *Royal Martyr*, declar’d the true sense of  
a free people, as follows; ‘ that the growth  
‘ and encrease of the (*then*) late troubles and  
‘ disorders did, in a very great measure, pro-  
‘ ceed from a multitude of seditious sermons,  
‘ pamphlets, and speeches, daily preached  
‘ and published, with a transcendent boldness,  
‘ defaming the person and government of *his*  
‘ (*then*) Majesty and his royal father, where-  
‘ in men were too much encouraged: and, a-  
‘ bove all, from the wilful mistake (b) of the  
‘ supream and lawful authority, whilst men

C 2

‘ were

(a) *Clarend. hist. rebell. vol. i, p. 522, in 8vo.* (b) This  
must needs be a *wilful mistake*, because ‘ the known laws of  
‘ the land have declar’d it so fully, and particularly the oath  
‘ of supremacy express’d it so clearly, that any man of or-  
‘ dinary capacity may understand it as well as the deepest  
‘ statesman in the world’. Bp. *Sanderson’s* pref. to Abp.  
*Usher’s* power of the Prince, &c. sect. xiv. And, as for  
the consequences of this mistake, another modern prelate well  
observes, that ‘ no change can be so beneficial—, as usurp-  
‘ ing upon lawful authority is destructive:—and, where  
‘ the pretence is real, yet, to seek publick good, in oppo-  
‘ sition to publick authority, is like curing distempers by  
‘ destroying the patient’! *Tho. Sherl. serm. 31 Jan. 1703.*

## xxviii The DEDICATION.

‘ were forward to cry up and maintain those  
 ‘ orders and ordinances, oaths and (a) cove-  
 ‘ nants, to be acts legal and warrantable,  
 ‘ which, in themselves, had not the least co-  
 ‘ lour of law or justice to support them.  
 ‘ From which kind of distempers, as the  
 ‘ present age is not wholly freed, so posterity  
 ‘ may be apt to relapse into them, if time-  
 ‘ ly remedy be not provided (b) ’.

If then, according to the sense of the na-  
 tion (which, however pretended, is never to  
 be so truly known as in such free (c) parlia-  
 ments)

(a) ‘ All associations and covenants against any of God’s  
 ‘ commandments, are directly covenants with death and a-  
 ‘ greements with hell: and all the oaths, vows and statutes,  
 ‘ made and framed thereupon, are directly mischiefs, fram-  
 ‘ ed by a law, and obligations sealed to serve the devil ’.  
 Dr. *Hudson* of government, 1647, at the end. And, it is  
 well worthy of remembrance, that, among the other *mo-  
 tives* gravely presented to the *house of Commons*, to prevail  
 with them to take the covenant, this was one, that ‘ the  
 ‘ devil himself will have a covenant from all his vassals, that  
 ‘ expect any extraordinary matters from him; else he will  
 ‘ not be engag’d to be at their command: there is not a  
 ‘ witch but she must seal a covenant ’! *Corn. Burges’s* serm.  
 17 Nov. 1640, p. 64. (b) Stat. xiii, *Car. ii*, cap. i. (c)  
 ‘ Many good people, — are miserably carried away by a  
 ‘ strange implicit faith, to believe, whatsoever is said or  
 ‘ done in the name of a parliament, and in the pretended  
 ‘ defence of religion, liberties, laws, to be infallibly true,  
 ‘ and altogether just ’. Dr. *Fern’s* resolv. of consc. 1642,  
 p. 1. But ‘ all parliaments are not always guided by an un-  
 ‘ erring spirit; but were many times sway’d by the heads  
 ‘ of the most powerful faction ’: Bp. *Griff. Williams’s* rights  
 of Kings 1662, fol. 91. And King *Charles I.* himself (in  
 his

## The DEDICATION. XXIX

ments) the *late troubles and disorders* (consequent upon the *grand rebellion*, which we to this day do yearly commemorate, with solemn professions of *detestation and abhorrence*;) *did indeed in a very great measure, proceed from seditious sermons, pamphlets, and speeches; and above all, from the wilful mistake of the supreme and lawful authority, &c.* (as you see they did;) how much does it behove all true churchmen and loyal subjects to encounter such *seditious (a) sermons, pamphlets, and speeches*, and, *above all*, to do their utmost endeavour to give their fellow subjects a true notion of the *supreme and lawful authority*; the *mistake* of which, it seems, has been so destru-

his second paper to Mr. Henderson, 6 June, 1646, p. 20.) says, ' I am confident to make it clearly appear to you, that  
' this church never did submit, nor was subordinate to the  
' *two houses of parliament*: and that it was only the King  
' and clergy who made the reformation; the parliament  
' merely serving to help to give the civil sanction'.

(a) ' The church of *England* — certainly abhors the rebel  
' in the pulpit, as well as the rebel in the field'; *Cha. Lambé's*  
serm. 28 Mar. 1717, p. 12. But, ' upon such a solemn oc-  
' casion as this, to speak carelessly and disrespectfully of the  
' royal cause, and the loyal adherents to it, to flirt at that  
' primitive doctrine of passive obedience, and start intricate  
' and perplex'd cases, which may, upon any pretence what-  
' soever, suppose the necessity of resisting the supreme pow-  
' er; what is it, but to erect a scaffold every year for the  
' righteous Martyr, and, without a vizard, continue to re-  
' peat the mournful stroke of the executioner'? *Edm. Archer's* serm. 30 Jan. 1710, p. 29.



### xxx The DEDICATION.

destructive to our nation! *Remember this, therefore, and shew your selves (a) men! subjects! Christians!* and since (we have the same authority to say, that) *the present age is not wholly freed from those kind of distempers*, see that you watch against them, and *stand fast in faith* (and loyalty!) *quit you like men! be (b) strong!* so that, it may please God, a timely remedy being happily *provided*, neither we, nor our *posterity*, may hereafter be subject to so fatal a *relapse*.

‘ Let us not suffer ourselves at any time  
‘ to be abused with a shew, nor to trust rash-  
‘ ly to pretences: because what hath hap-  
‘ pen’d may happen again; and to tread in  
‘ the same track, is the ready way to drop in  
‘ the same (c) snare’: and ‘ what a shame  
‘ wou’d it be for us, meanly and basely to  
‘ betray that cause, for which our ancestors  
‘ sacrific’d their (d) lives’? yet, ‘ I know  
‘ not how it comes to pass, but so it often  
‘ happens, that they who are most secure of  
‘ truth on their side, are most apt to be remiss  
‘ and careless, and to comfort themselves with  
‘ some good old sayings, as *God will provide*,  
‘ and

(a) *Isa.* xlv. 8. (b) *1 Cor.* xvi. 13. (c) *Pelling's* serm. 30 *Jan.* 1681, p. 31. (d) *Stillingsf.* serm. 21 *Sept.* 1673, p. 45.

## The DEDICATION. xxxi

‘ and *truth will prevail*, though they lye  
 ‘ still, and do nothing towards it: but cer-  
 ‘ tainly such negligence is inexcusable, where  
 ‘ the matter is of so great importance, the  
 ‘ adversaries so many, and an account must  
 ‘ be given shortly in another world, of what  
 ‘ men have done or suffer’d — in (a) this’.  
 The same causes will naturally produce the  
 same effects: and, if it shou’d be our misfor-  
 tune now, as it was then, that *men want the*  
*courage, or the conscience*, to oppose such a  
 growing evil, whilst it is in their power, how  
 just will it be in Almighty God, to give us up  
 to be a prey to the like usurpations, and to  
*consume both us and our (b) King!* — which  
 God avert.

What a calamitous condition our natural  
 soveraign has heretofore been liable to, and  
 how wonderfully restor’d, is thus describ’d,  
 by some eminent divines, *viz.* that ‘ he was  
 ‘ forc’d to live in exile and banishment, di-  
 ‘ vested of royal power, and all the ensigns  
 ‘ of majesty, reduc’d to a precarious, and  
 ‘ sometimes a necessitous state, while he saw  
 ‘ his friends impoverish’d and ruin’d, his loy-  
 ‘ al subjects oppress’d, his enemies trium-  
 ‘ phant,

(a) *Ibid.* p. 48. (b) 1 *Sam.* xii. 25.

## xxxii The DEDICATION.

'phant, too vigilant, and too powerful, to  
 'allow any hope to see an end of these trou-  
 'bles: but that God, who can do what he  
 'pleases, and oftentimes does such things, as  
 'no human force nor power can effect, put  
 'an end to these troubles, and restor'd him  
 'to his father's throne in peace and honour,  
 'and with the universal joy and triumph of  
 'his subjects — ; without any power of his  
 'own, without the help and assistance of fo-  
 'reign allies; while his friends at home were  
 'oppress'd, while the same power that drove  
 'him out was still in the hands of his ene-  
 'mies; while so many persons, who were  
 'in greatest power, were concerned, for their  
 'own preservation, to keep him out; while  
 'those who wish'd his return durst not whis-  
 'per any thing tending to call the King back  
 ' (a) again: and (which ought the more to  
 'endear our deliverance) all this was brought  
 'about by a miracle of mercy, far beyond all  
 'our hopes and contrivances, at a time when  
 'we were quite lost, without all visible means  
 'of a (b) restoration'. *After all, — seeing  
 that our God hath punished us less than our  
 iniquities deserve, and given us such a deli-  
 verance*

(a) Dr. Sherl. serm. on the discov. of the plot, 1683, p. 4.  
 (b) Dr. Jane's serm. 11 Apr. 1679, p. 46.

## The DEDICATION. XXXiii

*verance as this, shou'd we again break his commandments, and provoke him by our repeated rebellions against him and his ordinance, what less can we expect, than that he wou'd be angry with us till he had consum'd us, so that there shou'd be no remnant nor (a) escaping.* For 'it is a fearful aggravation of sin, after great judgments and great deliverances, to return to sin, and especially to the same sins again: because this can hardly be without our sinning against knowledge; and— is an argument of a very perverse and incorrigible (b) temper'.

'What the state of things is now, — I shall not need to observe. We all see it, and know it full well. And if I should say moreover, that there are some still among us, as deeply tainted with those principles of sedition and rebellion, which brought about this day's tragedy, as any of their fathers were, and who, if they had liv'd in their days, would have been as forward as the forwardest of them were, in unhinging the government, and destroying the church, nay, and in bringing their sovereign to the block: though some per-

d

'haps

(a) *Ezra ix. 13, 14.* (b) *Dr. Tillotson. lerm. 31 Jan. 1688, p. 15, and 13.*



# xxxiv The DEDICATION.

‘ haps would be angry at my saying this, I  
 ‘ fear it would be only for my speaking a  
 ‘ truth out of season; and they, I believe,  
 ‘ wou’d be most angry with me for saying it,  
 ‘ who best know it to be a (a) truth’, ‘ And  
 ‘ I am exceedingly afraid, — the very crime  
 ‘ of this day is not so generally, so thorough-  
 ‘ ly repented of, as it ought to be. If it be,  
 ‘ how comes it to pass, that the very same  
 ‘ maxims and doctrines, — are so publickly  
 ‘ avow’d and industriously propagated? And  
 ‘ what can be the meaning of that barbarous  
 ‘ (b) featt, that is said (nor can it be gainsaid)  
 ‘ to be annually kept up, to mock the sad  
 ‘ solemnity of the day, and glory in the exe-  
 ‘ crable (c) deed’?

But, because (I know) such diabolical tri-  
 umphs in the most monstrous wickedness can-  
 not easily find credit, among men of true *Eng-  
 lish* spirits, I think it necessary to inform my  
 reader, that several of our young nobility and  
 gentry, having been train’d up in seminaries  
 of schism, have there been (as it were) cate-  
 chiz’d into a belief, that the murder of our  
 King was a gallant and heroick action! wit-  
 ness

(a) Bp. Blackall’s serm. 31 Jan. 1708, p. 21, in 8vo.

(b) Meaning the Calve’s-head club. (c) Dr. Moss’s serm.  
 30 Jan. 1706, p. 27, 28.

## The DEDICATION. XXXV

ness Lord *William (a) Russel*, and others; who, if not thus unhappily prejudic'd by an ill-fated education, might have liv'd and died in peace and honour. Nay, some of the party, even in our times, tho' they pretend to abhor the bloody fact, don't blush to undertake a (b) profess'd justification of those *anti-*

d 2

*christian*

(a) This noble person was not only influenc'd by the principles of Dr. *Manton*, Mr. *Johnson*, and others of the republican class, but had been sent for education, together with the sons of many noblemen and gentlemen, to one *Lewis*, 'a stickling Presbyterian, that had gotten the sequestration of *Totenham-Highcross*, from Mr. *Wimperew*, a loyal minister of the church of England': which impious wretch, *Lewis*, 'to divert his scholars, compos'd a farce, where-  
' in the young gentlemen were to be actors. The farce  
' had all the formalities of a *high-court of justice*; president,  
' solicitor, witnesses, &c. The criminal was an old shock  
' water dog, which he called *Charles Stuart*! this dog was  
' arraign'd, try'd, condemn'd, and executed, by cutting off  
' his head! by which action he instilled the principles of  
' king-killing into his scholars; as if the murd'ring of a  
' King were no more than the cutting off a dog's neck'! *Tho. Long's* hist. of plots, 1684, p. 186. (b) *Ja. Peirce*, a licens'd preacher, in *the Curse-causeless*, (a sermon, at *Exon*, 30 Jan. 1716) does not only boast, that he never cou'd see reason to fast, or pay any religious regard to the day, (pref. p. iii.) and call it a *fasting for strife* (p. ge 6.) but is so audacious, as to affirm, that 'a great part of the matter (*charg'd upon their party*)---is so far from being criminal, that it is  
' truly noble, and deserves much praise and commendation'! (p. 12.) meaning (as he confesses) *what was done against the King, or his evil counsellors*: and that 'all the  
' world must justify that parliament, for standing up in defence of the right of the subjects', &c. (p. 13.) He presumes to call that resistance and open rebellion a *noble stand*! (p. 13, 14.) to which, he says, *we are indebted, that we are*

not

## xxxvi The DEDICATION.

*christian* principles, which naturally and directly tended to it: as if they presum'd, that they had, not an indulgence only for consciences truly tender, but even a licence to *sow* their *tares* of rebellion and heresy; and that too, not in the night-time, as the old (a) *enemy* did, but in the open day!

With

*not a generation of slaves!* (p. 14.) he calls the King's loyal and faithful servants *a corrupt and vile ministry*; and the learned and pious bishops, and other orthodox divines, *a vicious, fawning clergy!* (ibid.) and all those who duly observe this anniversary, according to the laws of our church and state, are lawcily stiled *angry men! profane men!* (p. 26) *the wicked!* (p. 27.) and compar'd to those *Jews and Heathens*, who *persecuted the Christians falsely for Christ's sake!* (p. 26.) while they (the self-call'd saints) are compar'd to *the best of men!* (p. 27.) to *David and Jeremy!* (p. 33.) to the apostles; yea, and to *the son of God himself!* (p. 27.) For they, good men, the *Presbyterians*, are *harmless and perfectly innocent!* (p. 9, 11, 16.) and must be suppo'd to have *a more than ordinary goodness!* (p. 27.) their *actions are such as merit commendation and praise!* (p. 9) and therefore *the curse of this day is causeless* (forsooth) as to them, *and shall come upon him that denounces it!* (p. 7, &c.) But (what is still more remarkable and surprizing) this zealous Revolutionist (as he wou'd nevertheless be thought) takes pains to retort it upon those of the church-party, who, in a later revolution, (as he with great boldness affirms) were as guilty of resisting and *lifting up the hand against the Lord's anointed*, and their actions 'as truly a conspiring his death, as any thing they were ever guilty of, who actually put his father to death'! (p. 21, 22.) nay, he endeavours to make the latter revolution the more unjustifiable; where he says, 'Will they blame us for standing up for our liberties, when we had the parliament — on our side; and yet think themselves innocent in inviting over the prince of *Orange*, to rescue their liberties, when they acted only in a private capacity?' *ibid.* p. 21.

(b) *St. Matth. xiii. 25, 28, 39.*

## The DEDICATION. xxxvii

With what view therefore a late eminent prelate made such pressing *exhortations to peace and union* with that party, I shall not take upon me to guess: but while the old leaven is still fermenting among them, and such principles as these are openly preach'd, and publish'd, with the undeserv'd encouragement of several editions, I leave the world to judge, whether any true churchman, or loyal subject, can think it honest or decent, to make a clamour, as if we *did wrong to our brethren*, 'either by loading them with false accusations, by aggravating some lesser matters, or by an undue prosecution of real, but repent-ed-of (a) faults'! I will not say, this was intended as an indirect insinuation, in order to the abolishing this anniversary commemoration, as some others have more directly intimated: but, amongst all the plausible reasons offer'd to that purpose, I think, the weakest is, that it was 'a fact, which no man now living cou'd possibly have a hand (b) in'! since that wou'd be a much stronger reason for abolishing (c) another, which I hope even these gentlemen themselves are hardly yet bold enough to venture upon.

How-

(a) Bp. Burnet's serm. 26 Nov. 1689, p. 45, in 160. (b) Dr. Mich. Hutchinson's serm. at Derby, 30 Jan. 1716, p. 14. (c) Good friday.



## xxxviii The DEDICATION.

However, that I might offer my *mite* towards the putting a stop to so contagious a *distemper* (at least so far as the holy scriptures are concern'd,) and in hopes that I might in some measure contribute, either to *preserve the minds of his Majesty's good subjects from such infections, or restore and recover* some of those who were already (*a infected*, by the notorious abuse and perversion thereof, I took the *courage* (rather than be liable to the imputation of the *want of conscience*, which the martyr of this day complains of) to offer to the publick, *A short history of the Regal Succession, and the rights of the several Kings recorded in the holy scriptures*: wherein it abund-

(a) \* Until some further order be taken herein, it is but  
 \* needful, that such treatises of this nature, as carry weight  
 \* and evidence with them, should be publish'd to the  
 \* world, for the settling of men's judgments and consciences  
 \* aright, as concerning the great duties of *christian* obedience  
 \* and subjection, and for the preventing of such  
 \* mischiefs as must unavoidably ensue, where those so necessary  
 \* points are either misrepresented by the leaders, or  
 \* misunderstood by the people'. Bp. *Sanderfon's* pref. to  
 \* Abp. *Usher* of the power of the prince, &c. § v. For he  
 \* that has a mind to destroy the discipline, the order, or  
 \* the very doctrine of the church of *England*, shall quote  
 \* ye twenty texts for't; and as many precedents (if there  
 \* shall be occasion) for diverting, or cutting off the succession;  
 \* nay, for deposing the King himself, and changing the very  
 \* form of the government. This is no more than what has been  
 \* actually done in the memory of man.  
 \* —The devil himself fishes with these baits': *L' Estr.*  
*Cafe put, 1680, p. 4.*

## The DEDICATION. XXXIX.

bundantly appears, how far the *republican* and *Eraſtian* ſchemes are from being warrant-  
ed by thoſe ſacred records, to which our mo-  
dern *aſſertors* (as they call themſelves) of the  
*rights of the chriſtian church*, and of the li-  
*berties of the people*, have the confidence to  
appeal for the truth of them.

For there we find not the leaſt footſtep of  
ſuch a *ſtate of nature*, as *Hobbes* and his fol-  
lowers dream of, (when men are pretended to  
have been born free from any yoke of go-  
vernment; that is, literally, *ſons of Belial*!)  
no popular election of Kings or prieſts! no o-  
riginal contract between the governours and  
governed! no coercion (a) over their ſacred  
perſons! nor any reſiſtance, rebellion, or even  
ſelf-defence againſt, much leſs any depoſition  
or murder of, the Lord's anointed, (as *Parſons*  
the Jeſuit, and the diſciples of his *Doleman* do  
contend for,) but what is plainly condemn'd  
by the Holy Ghoſt. But, on the contrary,  
there

(a) It is accordingly declar'd, in the act that appoints the  
obſervation of this day, that, by the undoubted and fundamen-  
tal laws of this kingdom. neither the peers of this realm, nor  
the commons, nor both together, in parliament or out of par-  
liament, nor the people, collectively or repreſentatively, nor a-  
ny other perſons whatſoever, ever had, have, or ought to  
have, any coercive power over the perſons of the Kings of this  
realm: Stat. xii. Car. II. ca. 30. And this parliamentary de-  
claration did not then firſt obtain the force of law, but was  
declarative of our original conſtitution.

## xl The DEDICATION.

there we find evidence as clear as the sun, that government (and even the monarchical form thereof) was originally instituted by God himself: that the succession thereto was, as well by the law of God as by that of nature, hereditary, from father to son, and so to the next of kin, whether male or female, according to priority of birth and proximity of blood, without regard to other personal endowments or qualifications: that, tho' such succession was sometimes defeated, and the reins of government put into other hands, yet whenever such revolutions happen'd, they were always held as unlawful, and usurpations; unless they carried with them very plain evidence of their being the Lord's doing (as in the cases of *Saul*, *David*, and *Solomon*;) that as Kings were unaccountable to the people, for their administration in the state, so were the high priests, in the church, absolutely independent on the state, in relation to the exercise of their spiritual powers; so that a schism in the church was form'd against the one, in the same manner as a rebellion and usurpation in the state were form'd against the other: and, in a word, that our lawful governours, both in church and state, and they alone, (not every *Oliver*, or other usurper

## The DEDICATION. xli

usurper or intruder, who gets possession of the regal or episcopal throne) are intituled to our obedience, by the apostolical (a) precepts.

While the first edition of that was in the press, another book happen'd to be publish'd, upon the same subject, intituled, *SCRIPTURE POLITICKS, or, an impartial account of the origin and measures of government, ecclesiastical and civil, taken out of the books of the old and new testament, &c.* by William Whiston, M. A. &c. 1717.

This rais'd my curiosity, to see how far I had the happiness to agree with a person, whose name has made so much noise in the world. But, upon the perusal thereof, I found his *Scripture-Politicks* and mine so very much unlike, as if they had not been taken out of the same record: for I observ'd, that gentleman had taken a great deal of pains to make his Bible a warrant for the *republican* scheme of government; whereas my observations therefrom were directly to the contrary. However, I had so humble an opinion of my own judgment, that I brought as many of the controverted passages, as my time wou'd then allow me, to the test of the Bible, to which we severally referr'd ourselves,

e for

(a) *Rom.* xiii. 1. *Titus* iii. 1. *Hebr.* xiii. 17. 1. *Pet.* ii. 13.



## xlii The DEDICATION.

for our vouchers: and, upon the comparison, I affirm, that in my Bible (of which I have several editions,) I cou'd find no manner of cause for me to have alter'd any thing in my *Short History*, had the copy been in my own, as it was then in the Printer's hands. But, since I found so many, and so very great (even fundamental) variances between us; lest the unwary reader shou'd be drawn into dangerous errors, without examination, I took occasion, in a short postscript to that edition, to give a general caution against it, as followeth. ' Since the foregoing *Short History* was ' put to the press, I have seen Mr. *Whiston's* ' new book of *Scripture-Politicks*; wherein, ' upon a transient view, I find, that celebrated author's judgment does honour to my ' observations, in many particulars. For, ' whoever has carefully read over these sheets, ' must needs, by this time, be convinc'd, ' that Mr. *Whiston* is notoriously mistaken, ' where he affirms, that it *appears in scripture, that nothing, in ordinary cases, but ' the free choice or recognition of a people, ' gives a just right to a prince to govern (a) ' them*; as well as in several *propositions* ' and arguments tending to the proof thereof

(a) Dedicat. p. iii.

## The DEDICATION. xliii

‘ of (a). I cou’d likewise point out many  
‘ places of that book, wherein the author  
‘ seems to have studied other *politicks* more  
‘ than those of the *holy scriptures*; but, as  
‘ that wou’d lead me beyond the bounds of  
‘ this my undertaking, I shall, at present,  
‘ leave the particulars to our impartial rea-  
‘ der’s own animadversion. I know, Mr.  
‘ *Whiston* has too great an aversion to Pope-  
‘ ry, to pretend to infallibility: and there-  
‘ fore, I hope, he will not take it ill, that I  
‘ have made a little free with his name and  
‘ writings. However, if he does, I desire  
‘ no favour from him, but only this, that the  
‘ Holy Bible may be allow’d for the rule of  
‘ our *Scripture-Politicks*’.

Upon this, I expected that he wou’d either  
have offer’d some better proof of his *proposi-  
tions*, which I had thus charg’d with *notori-  
ous mistakes*, or else have call’d upon me to  
make good my charge, by exhibiting the  
particular articles of that general impeach-  
ment: but, all in vain! Mr. *Whiston*’s repu-  
tation in *Scripture-Politicks* is (it seems) so  
well establish’d, that nothing I can say needs  
to give him the trouble of a vindication; and  
that of so inconsiderable a writer is not worth

(a) See *propof. viii. p. 8, &c.*

## xliv The DEDICATION.

any other judicious person's notice: so that hitherto, as Mr. *Whiston's* is undefended, so my little book remains unconfuted, unanswered. I own indeed, that I met with some few hints, in accidental conversation, which convinc'd me that I was too *short* in the explanation of two or three particulars: but I never yet have read or heard of any thing therein mistaken; except only one passage, in the case of *Jehoahaz*, the son of *Josiah*, and some few trivial *errata* of the press.

In this edition therefore (to which I have been induc'd by several motives, needless here to be mention'd) I have not only taken care to correct that oversight, but have also intermix'd *remarks* upon several cases, as I had opportunity to meet with them, misreported, by Mr. *Whiston*, and several others: tho' in truth the number of such misreported cases is so great, and those writers and preachers, who have laid themselves open to censure for it, so many, that I had not room and opportunity to take proper notice of them all. I might add, that several of them are so very high in place, and the esteem of the world, that it might have been more for my own private interest (had I consulted That more than I do the Truth) to have let them quite alone:

## The DEDICATION. xlv

alone: but whilst our controversy is about the holy scriptures (which ought to be the rule of our conduct in every thing,) the more eminent and popular the persons are, who appear on the other side of the question, so much the more danger is there of infection therefrom, and consequently so much the more necessity for us to be upon our guard against it.

Perhaps indeed I shou'd not have troubl'd you with particular *remarks* upon Mr. *Whiston's* mistakes in *Scripture-Politicks* (after such a general censure of them,) had he stood alone, and not been seconded and supported by some, whose notions, tho' every whit as pernicious, are not usually read with so good a guard, as those of Mr. *Whiston*; and therefore are the more capable of doing mischief. Besides which, as theirs are (most of them) scatter'd abroad in many different pamphlets and sermons, but his reduc'd to the narrow compass of one Book, I thought that, by confuting him, I shou'd confute them; (for they generally argue upon the same common topicks;) and the same answer that you meet with here, to his *politicks*, will serve any of the rest, (wheresoever you may chance to find them,



## xlvi The DEDICATION.

them,) as well as if they had been particularly animadverted on.

In the doing of which, I may say of Mr. *Whiston*, (as a late reverend and pious divine said, in a like case, with respect to another of the same order,) ‘ I have examin’d his opinions, with the same freedom that he has propos’d them; and which the interest of truth and righteousness require, as I conceive, in this case: and this freedom, I believe, will not be offensive to himself. For, if they will stand, it will give him further opportunity to clear them: but, if they will not, as I verily think they will not, it will concern all, and no person more than himself, to be shew’d the falshood of (a) them’. And, to convince Mr. *Whiston*, how free I am from any prejudice or byass whatsoever in this examination, I do sincerely profess to every reader, and to him in particular, (in his own words,) that I ‘ lay aside all human, all uncertain political schemes: I don’t consider even the several advantages and disadvantages of the present, or any other government now in the world; for which, or against which, I properly write not: but I endeavour to discover  
’ what

(a) *Kettlew. works*, vol. ii. fol. 197.

## The DEDICATION. xlvii

‘ what is truth, and what is right, and what  
 ‘ is our duty, as *Christians*, in these impor-  
 ‘ tant (a) affairs ’; always remembering that  
 wise saying of a very learned and famous fo-  
 reigner, that ‘ the faithful historian is of no  
 ‘ age or nation: tho’ he loves his country,  
 ‘ he never flatters it in any (b) particular ’.

And yet I’m not insensible, that some there  
 are who *will not endure sound* (c) *doctrine*, and  
 wou’d rather go on in a by-way of their own,  
 than undergo the small mortification to con-  
 fess that they had mistaken the right road:  
 or, in plain terms, who, notwithstanding the  
 force of truth, and the conviction of their  
 own consciences, will not suffer their practices  
 or principles to be question’d, without the  
 utmost impatience and resentment; but treat  
 the author with the more rage and malice,  
 the less they find themselves able to answer  
 him. But, let such learn, from the famous  
 Dr. *Tillotson*, that ‘ all doctrines are vehe-  
 ‘ mently to be suspected, which decline trial,  
 ‘ and are so loth to be brought into the light;  
 ‘ which will not endure a fair examination,  
 ‘ but magisterially require an implicate faith:  
 ‘ whereas truth is bold and full of courage,  
 ‘ and

(a) *Whist. script. polit. dedic. p. xix.*  
 on learn. p. 84.

(b) *M. de Fenelon*

(c) *2 Tim. iv. 3.*

## xlviïï The DEDICATION.

‘ and loves to appear openly ; and is so secure  
‘ and confident of her own strength, as to  
‘ offer herself to the severest trial and exami-  
‘ nation. But, to deny all liberty of enqui-  
‘ ry and judgment — is the greatest injury  
‘ and disparagement to truth that can be,  
‘ and a tacit acknowledgment that she lies  
‘ under some (a) disadvantage ’.

For my own part, the natural inclination of my *genius* might have been powerful enough to divert me from hazarding my peace and quiet by such an engagement, and to avoid the sting which commonly is the fate of him who disturbs a nest of Hornets: but, some cases there are, as I have shewn before, wherein every man is to be a soldier, and even silence it self wou’d be criminal; which consideration alone prevail’d with me to buckle on my armour, not regarding the hazards I might be personally expos’d to, for doing my duty.

If it shou’d therefore be my fate, in this encounter, to meet with no better return than that of foul (b) language, (as many others

(a) Tillotson serm. 4 Apr. 1679, p. 37, 38, in 4to. (b) Among the rest, this will probably be call’d the *making a step towards Popery*; and that indeed with as much propriety as the asserting of the *independency of the church upon the state*, as to its powers meerly spiritual, and the *invalidity of lay-baptism*.

## The DEDICATION. xlix

thers have been rewarded for much better performances,) I shall patiently bear my share of it, whilst he who throws the dirt can't escape with clean hands, out of the kennel from whence he rakes it: and it will be satisfaction enough to my own mind, ' if I may ' so strike the favourable opportunity in this ' attempt, as, by God's blessing, to *strengthen* ' any of *those who stand* for us, *help* the waver- ' ing who wou'd otherwise be against us, ' or *raise up those that are fallen* from us; ' and thereby approve my fidelity to my great ' (a) master ', under whose *banner* I am list- ' ed, and whose *cross* I have not yet deserted.

It was a heroic saying of an exemplary prelate, in times of danger, that *he thanked God, he never much knew what fear was, when he was once satisfied in the goodness of his* (b) *cause*: and I humbly trust in God, that, so

f long

*tism*, have been boldly call'd so by Bp. Burnet (serm. 7 Nov. 1710, p. 24.) and others: whereas 'tis evident, to every man of common learning, that the former of these doctrines is older than *Popery* itself, and the latter contrary to the known principles and practice of the *Papists*! But all these *old outcries and noise of Popery*, when *lowdest and most clamorous*, are ' as sure a sign of some violent assault from ' *Presbytery*, as a ruffian's endeavouring to divert your eyes ' from himself, betokens his intention of stabbing you in ' the back '! *Walk. suff. clergy, pref. fol. x.*

(a) *Stubs's* serm. 4 Octob. 1702, ep. dedicat. (b) Bp. *Lake*.



# 1 The DEDICATION.

long as I have the holy scriptures for my foundation, and you, *true churchmen and loyal subjects*, for my patrons, I shou'd not have been much discourag'd, in the quest or defence of the truth, tho' I cou'd have apprehended, that I was, in so doing, necessarily to *wrestle against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high (a) places!*

I might also presume upon the laws of the land, as my warrant: but, as that is, at present, out of my sphere, my concern here being wholly with those of God, and this my undertaking confined to *Scripture-Politicks*, I shall leave it to others of more leisure and capacity, to clear our constitution, from the suspicion of favouring such notions, as are utterly destructive of all manner of government in the world.

In the mean time, (since it is *not foreign to any man's office, upon all just occasions, to inculcate such doctrines*, as tend to *settle the measures of Christian duty*, and consequently to *promote the happiness of human (b) society*,) I cou'd wish to see a collection of our national laws

(a) *Ephes. vi. 12.* (b) *B. Hoadly's serm. 29 Sept. 1705. p. 18; and 22 Mar. 1707, at the end.*

## The DEDICATION. II

laws carefully made, by a skilful hand, and set in a full and clear light, that we might the better be able to judge in this important affair, whether we are impos'd on, by those who affirm, that the *imperial crown of England may be prov'd, even from our statute (a) book, to be deriv'd immediately from God,* (and not from the people,) as being *the King of Kings, and sole disposer of all earthly crowns and kingdoms;* and that the same ought to descend, according to the course of inheritance, by inherent birth-right, to him who is *lineally, justly, and lawfully, the next and sole heir of the blood royal:* that such as have heretofore obtain'd the crown in any other way are stil'd only *pretended Kings, or Kings de facto, and usurpers;* and that, *as such, their acts are held to be of no force in law:* that there can be no interregnum, or vacancy of the throne, but immediately, upon the death of the King, his next heir (who-

f 2

ever-

(a) The Statutes usually referr'd to are thus noted, 1 *Edw. III. c. 1.* 25 *Edw. III. c. 2.* 16 *Rich. II. c. 5.* 1 *Edw. IV. c. 1.* 24 *Hen. VIII. c. 12.* 25 *Hen. VIII. c. 19, 21, 22.* 26 *Hen. VIII. c. 1.* 37 *Hen. VIII. c. 17.* 1 *Mar. Sess. ii. c. 4.* 2 *Mar. Sess. ii. c. 1.* 1 *Eliz. c. 1, 3.* 5 *Eliz. c. 1.* 13 *Eliz. c. 2, 14.* 1 *Ja. I. c. 1, 7.* 3 *Ja. I. c. 4.* 12 *Car. II. c. 12.* 14, 39. 13 *Car. II. c. 1, 2, 4, 6.* 13 *Car. II. Sess. ii. c. 1.* 13 and 14 *Car. II. c. 3, 4.* besides many more which I omit.

## lii The DEDICATION.

*ever he is) becomes King in the same instant; and while the rightful King is kept out of possession, the laws are suspended, and have no operation: that the whole sovereignty is in the King, and all the forces and strength of the kingdom his sole right; and he is not accountable to his people for his administration thereof, much less punishable by them for his abuse of it: that even the three estates are so far from being co-ordinate with, or having any coercive power over their King, that the commons were but petitioners to him, for the making his laws, as the other two estates (of Lords spiritual and temporal) were his counsellors to advise him in it, &c. These, and many more conclusions of the like sort, have been frequently drawn from our acts of parliament, by men of great reputation for learning: but, as I have no opportunity at present to examine the originals with the care and caution that the subject requires, I shall leave my readers to judge for themselves; whilst I content my self with observing, that the same free parliament, which attainted the *regicides*, for the execrable murder of their lawful King, did also expressly ‘ renounce, a-  
‘ bominat, and protest against all proceed-  
‘ ings*

## The DEDICATION. liii

'ings tending (a) thereto'; and consequently therefore against all those *seditionous sermons, pamphlets, and speeches*, from whence (as is before prov'd) *the growth and increase of the then late troubles and disorders did in a very great measure proceed.*

But I must not forget to make some apology for my self, with regard to the stile, which I am aware may be liable to various objections; and the more so, because the subject itself has many inveterate enemies. Some of these (whose sense of feeling does not lie in their consciences) will probably cry out against me, as if my pen had been too sharp, and my ink too full of gall: but upon the strictest review, I can't find any thing dropp'd that way, which the subject does not require, and the season fairly excuse. For, who can treat of such a parricide, or the proceedings tending to it, with an honest *English* heart, in softer terms than I have done? nay, wou'd not such an unprecedented act rather justify the sharpest expressions any language can furnish, in detestation of the actors and their abettors? whereas I have chiefly attack'd the principles only, and left the men to their doom! *Rebellion,*

(a) Stat. 12 Car. II. c. 30.



## liv The DEDICATION.

*Rebellion*, you know, is compar'd to (a) *witchcraft*: and a witch must expect to be severely scratch'd! but (to be serious, as the occasion requires,) I doubt not but to be acquitted of this charge by all true loyalists, when you consider, what moderation and temper a man had need be of, that, in this nation and this age, shall speak against faction and rebellion, without extraordinary (b) severity. Were the tragedy of this day so duly and thoroughly repented of, that we cou'd reasonably hope God wou'd no longer visit us with his judgments on that account, I cou'd be content, for the honour of the *Protestant* name, (which *hath receiv'd so great* (c) *a wound and reproach* by it,) that it were buried in utter *oblivion*: but that can never be, so long as principles of the same direct tendency (not to say, the fact itself also) are openly maintain'd, justify'd and gloried in! and I can vouch even the moderate Abp. Tillotson himself to shew, that *we must not use mildness in the case of a wilful and heinous sin; especially if it be exemplary, and of publick influence: to rebuke gently upon such an occasion, is rather to countenance the*  
*fault;*

(a) 1 Sam. xv. 23. (b) Sprat's serm. 20 Apr. 1682, ep. dedic. (c) Stat. 12 Car. II. c. 30.

## THE DEDICATION. IV

fault; and seems to argue, that we are not sensible enough of the enormity of it, and that we have not a due dislike and detestation for (a) it, &c.

But, whilst I am thus accumulating my vouchers, I am more justly apprehensive of another objection; that my whole book is crowded with quotations. This, I fear, will be an eye-sore at the first sight: tho' when you come to the perusal, and observe to what purpose they are severally produc'd, the question will be only, whether they are pertinently apply'd, either in support of my own *History*, or of my *Remarks* upon that of others: for if they be, (as I hope they will be judg'd,) I may expect a much softer censure, for my scrupulous, tho' unfashionable, honesty (in owning whence I took them, so that every man may have his own again,) than I shou'd have deserv'd, if I had pass'd them for my own, without any other title to them, than that pyratrical one of bare possession only. Besides, by my quoting them thus fully, by whole periods, the reader is enabl'd

(a) *Tillotf.* concerning the education of children, ferm. 2. (as I have him quoted;) but I'm not certain that these are his very words, nor have I opportunity now to examine the original.

## lvi The DEDICATION.

to judge of the strength of my additional evidence, drawn from personal authority, as well as of the force of my arguments against the adversary: whereas, if I had laid before him only the substance of what has been occasionally written on either side, he must have depended upon my judgment and impartiality, more perhaps than my small stock of reputation wou'd have given me a right to expect. And moreover, by thus setting the opinions of many of the principal men of all parties, (when they were not prejudic'd by passion, nor byass'd by interest,) as it were in one view, and in a clear light, the truth will the more naturally be discover'd among them; especially where they all concur in the same common sentiments: and that which their own greatest favourites have sometime deliberately preach'd for sound doctrine, ' I hope, ' will not be thought otherwise now; for ' truth doth never alter, nor vary with the ' times, whatever the professors of it may (a) ' do '.

However, it cannot be deny'd, that such a mixture of various paragraphs, from divers hands, and on different occasions, can't but  
render

(a) *Ja. Elleby's* serm. 30 *Jan.* 1684, pref.

## The DEDICATION. Ivii

render the style of the whole somewhat rugged and uneven; and 'tis certain, that an even thread, fine smooth language, and well-turn'd periods wou'd have much better recommended the discourse to the nicer reader's favour: but, as I always thought that to be the best expression, which had the best effect upon the judgment and practice of those to whom it was address'd: so, in this treatise of the constitution of the *Jewish* government, I chose to express my self in such plain modern terms, as have a known and determin'd sense and meaning, among those whom I am to expect for my readers; and therefore I perswade myself, that *you* will not be critical, but overlook the unpolish'd dress it appears in, and receive the truth to your protection, for its own sake: for ' we all  
' know, that 'tis not what is artfully pleaded,  
' but what is fully prov'd; not what may be  
' said by us, but what the law says, that  
' ought to be our rule, in all such (a) cases '.

And now, what remains, but that all of us, in our respective stations, apply our selves dutifully and diligently to the putting a stop to those pernicious doctrines, and trait'rous practices, which have heretofore overwhelm'd

g

both

(a) *Whist. script. polit. epist. dedic. p. xx.*



## lviii The DEDICATION.

both our church and state in one common ruin? Wherein, that our honest endeavours may have the better effect, so as that those horrid sins which we have this day renounc'd, may never be repeated, at least in this our nation, let us learn, before it be too late, to live in the *true faith and fear of God, in true loyalty and obedience to his Vicegerent, and in brotherly love and charity one towards another*: and then we may, with the greater assurance, address our selves to the *King of Kings, and governour of all things* (in the words of our most excellent Liturgy,) to *in-fatuate and defeat all the secret counsels of the ungodly; to abate their pride, assuage their malice, and confound their devices; to strengthen the hands of our gracious sovereign, with judgment and justice, to cut off all such workers of iniquity, as turn religion into rebellion, and faith into faction; that they may never again prevail against us, nor triumph in the ruin of the Monarchy and his Church amongst us*; which is the constant prayer of

Your hearty well-wisher and  
Humble Servant,

J. L.

# The CONTENTS.

§ I	THE Introduction	Pag. 1
I.	A Summary of <i>anti-scriptural Principles</i>	2
II.	Government of divine Institution	7
III.	— monarchical	8
IV.	— successive, according to <i>Birth-right</i>	10
V.	<i>Adam's</i> Monarchy political	17
VI.	— and hereditary	20
VII.	<i>Noah's</i> Monarchy political	21
VIII.	The Nations divided	23
IX.	<i>Nimrod's</i> Usurpation	27
X.	The Succession of <i>Shem</i>	30
XI.	— <i>Abram</i>	32
XII.	— <i>Isaac</i>	32
XIII.	— <i>Jacob</i>	35
XIV.	— <i>Judah</i>	37
XV.	— <i>Joseph</i>	40
XVI.	— <i>Ephraim</i>	41
XVII.	The Law of Nature	41
XVIII.	<i>Moses</i> a King	52
XIX.	— absolute and irresistible	53
XX.	— the first Lawgiver	58
XXI.	Law of Inheritance in general	58
XXII.	— according to Proximity of Blood	59
XXIII.	— indefeasible	60
XXIV.	<i>Joshua</i> an absolute Sovereign	75
XXV.	Judges rais'd up by God himself	82
XXVI.	Kings of all Nations	97
XXVII.	— hereditary	100
XXVIII.	— absolute	103
XXIX.	— irresistible	106
XXX.	<i>Saul's</i> election divine	110
XXXI.	— his power absolute	114
XXXII.	— and irresistible	117
XXXIII.	<i>David</i> a King by divine Right	126
XXXIV.	— absolute and irresistible	129
XXXV.	— yet rebell'd against by his Son <i>Abalom</i>	132
	§ XXXVI.	

# The CONTENTS.

§ XXXVI. <i>Absalom's</i> Revolution-Principles expos'd	140
XXXVII. <i>David's</i> Restoration	146
XXXVIII. <i>Sheba's</i> Revolt, and sudden Fate	150
XXXIX. <i>Solomon</i> a King by divine Right	153
XL. ——— and irresistible	159
XLI. The Case of <i>Solomon</i> and <i>Abiathar</i> stated	161
XLII. <i>Rehoboam's</i> hereditary Right	178
XLIII. The hereditary Succession of <i>Abijah</i>	182
XLIV. — <i>Asha</i> , <i>Jehosaphat</i> , <i>Jehoram</i> and <i>Abaziah</i>	185
XLV. — <i>Joash</i>	187
XLVI. — <i>Amaziah</i>	197
XLVII. — <i>Uzziah</i>	197
XLVIII. — <i>Jotham</i> , <i>Abaz</i> , <i>Hezekiah</i> , <i>Manasseh</i> , and <i>Amon</i>	203
XLIX. — <i>Josiah</i>	206
L. Interruption of the Succession, the Cause of Ruin	207
LI. Hereditary Right the ordinary Rule of Succession among God's people	209
LII. And passive Obedience their indispensable Duty	211
LIII. The Revolt of the ten Tribes from the Heirs of <i>David</i>	212
LIV. The Grounds of that revolution examin'd	213
LV. Their miserable State describ'd in general	223
LVI. And in particular, under <i>Jeroboam</i> and <i>Nadab</i>	225
LVII. — <i>Baasha</i> and <i>Elah</i>	243
LVIII. — <i>Zimri</i>	243
LIX. — <i>Omri</i> , <i>Abah</i> , <i>Abaziah</i> and <i>Jehoram</i>	243
LX. — <i>Jehu</i> , <i>Jehoahaz</i> , <i>Joash</i> , <i>Jeroboam</i> and <i>Zachariah</i>	250
LXI. — <i>Shallum</i>	252
LXII. — <i>Menahem</i> and <i>Pekebiab</i>	252
LXIII. — <i>Pekab</i> .	253
LXIV. — <i>Hoshea</i>	253
LXV. Some Hints from other Nations	255
APPENDIX, relating to the State of the Case under the Gospel	258



T H E  
SHORT HISTORY  
O F T H E  
REGAL SUCCESSION,



HAVING oftentimes, *The Intro-*  
with great concern, *duction.*  
observed, how much the minds  
of his Majesty's subjects are  
distracted, by the various glos-  
ses, which artful and designing  
men have put upon the succession of several of  
the Kings recorded in the holy scriptures (eve-  
ry one of them endeavouring to make the word  
of God serve his own turn, whereby plausible ar-  
guments are often pass'd upon the unwary rea-  
der for authentick evidence (a), I could not but  
B think

(a) *Whist. script. polit. dedicat. p. 20. See also the remarks*  
of Mr. G. C. (*Geo. Conway*, I suppose) in his sermon, 12 May,  
1717, entitled, *Justice done to the sacred text, &c.* (soon after  
Bishop Hoadly's sermon of *The nature of the kingdom or Church of*  
*Christ*)



## 2 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

think it would be of service to my countrymen, to lay before them *A short history of the Regal Succession, and the rights of the several Kings in those sacred records.* And as my only end in this publication is to prevent a delusion, or undeceive the deluded ; so the best mean thereto is, in as plain and summary a manner, as the nature of the subject will bear, to continue it down from the beginning of all things, so far as God's people ( the *Jews* ) had any known government among them : In the doing of which, I have too awful a regard for the subject, to presume to deal unfaithfully with it ; and, as to the christian reader, I have, by constantly quoting chapter and verse, laid my self at his mercy to correct me wherever I may happen to be mistaken.

§ I. IT has frequently been lamented by many eminent and judicious authors, that multitudes of principles, supposed to tend to the subversion of government in general, and of ours in particular, have from time to time been industriously disseminated amongst us, by writers and

*Christ.*) ' Such is the degeneracy, so great the corruption of human kind, that many times (says he) even the scripture itself is handled with a deceitful heart, and wilfully misconstrued by the children of this world; who are wiser in their generation, and craftier to establish their iniquities by a law, than the children of light are to countermine their endeavours.' p. 3. in 8vo. And Dr. *Trap's* to the same purpose, on the same subject, 19 May, 1717, p. 1. in 8vo.

and preachers, of divers classes, and seemingly different interests; the fatal effects of which I need not here to (a) mention: but, forasmuch as the holy scriptures have been gravely vouch'd to patronize them, I think it may be proper to open the following history with a summary view of the most considerable of those which have been controverted as antisciptural; so that the reader may be the better prepar'd to examine them by the several cases hereafter stated.

Now the principles, which come most properly under our consideration here, with any relation to that execrable fact, to which this whole history is directly propos'd to be applied, are such as these; viz. ' That the people were  
 ' all at first, born free! That all au-  
 ' thority was originally vested in them,  
 ' and derived from them, as in  
 ' whom alone is the plenitude of power, and  
 ' absolute sovereignty! That they have a right  
 ' to chuse and change their governours, and

*A summary of controverted principles.*

B 2 to

(a) ' These are principles, which to give them that honour  
 ' which is due for their extraction and kindred, were first  
 ' begotten by the Jesuit (the father of *Ravillacs*,) then nursed up  
 ' by *Buchanan* (the father of rebels,) and at last adopted by the  
 ' *Leviathan* (the father of Atheists!) And it is impossible there  
 ' should be any firm peace, or lasting safety, either for prince  
 ' or subject, in any kingdom where these doctrines prevail;  
 ' which have been all along design'd and maintained to ruin kings,  
 ' and all hereditary monarchies.' Dr. *Edw. Peilling's* serm. 5  
 ' *Novemb. 1682, p. 29.*

#### 4 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

‘ to limit them with laws at their pleasure ! That  
‘ they have a coercive power over their Kings,  
‘ and may resist, arraign and depose them, when  
‘ they see cause ! That the supreme Power is  
‘ not in the King, but in the people ; nor  
‘ any allegiance due to Kings, without the election,  
‘ submission or consent of the people ! That  
‘ their concurrence is essentially necessary to  
‘ sovereign authority ; the voice of the people  
‘ being the voice of God ! That the King’s  
‘ power is not absolute, but delegate from the  
‘ people ; and their crowns held only in trust  
‘ for the commonwealth ! That tho’ the King  
‘ is superior to them as single persons, he is in-  
‘ ferior to the collective body ! That there is  
‘ a mutual compact between every King and his  
‘ people ; and they are no longer bound to  
‘ obey him than he performs his contract ! That  
‘ allegiance and protection are reciprocal ; and  
‘ in default of the latter the former ceases !  
‘ That self-preservation is the fundamental law  
‘ of nature, and supersedes all other obligations,  
‘ whenever they stand in competition with it ;  
‘ the people’s safety being the supreme law !  
‘ That the people may lawfully convene them-  
‘ selves, or their representatives in a parliamen-  
‘ tary way, without the king’s writ, and make  
‘ laws and constitutions, to bind the body of  
‘ the nation, by their own authority ! That no  
‘ King has a natural right to the crown by birth,  
‘ without coronation, and the people’s consent :  
‘ And

## *the* REGAL SUCCESSION 5

‘ and the next heir may lawfully be excluded  
‘ from the succession, for the security of the  
‘ people’s liberty, property or religion! That  
‘ personal merit is more to be regarded than  
‘ birth-right: wickedness a forfeiture of natural  
‘ right: and difference in religion, a just cause  
‘ of excluding or deposing of Kings or their  
‘ heirs; dominion being founded in grace! That  
‘ the magistrate is the minister of God no longer,  
‘ or otherwise, than while he exercises his office  
‘ for his people’s good! That in case of idola-  
‘ try, heresy, popery, persecution, tyranny, ar-  
‘ bitrary power, or any mal-administration, the  
‘ people lawfully may resist, and their represen-  
‘ tatives are bound in duty, for the publick good,  
‘ to depose, yea to arraign and put to death,  
‘ any the most rightful prince; being in all such  
‘ cases (of which also they are the judges) freed  
‘ from all subjection and allegiance! That such  
‘ resistance is justifiable by scripture in case of  
‘ necessity; and there is no obligation to pas-  
‘ sive obedience in such like cases! That posses-  
‘ sion and power give a right to govern; and  
‘ success is an evidence of God’s favour! That  
‘ submission to powers in possession (without re-  
‘ gard to other titles) is due by the law and  
‘ gospel, because it is to follow the conduct of  
‘ divine providence! That obedience is due to  
‘ usurpers, as much as to the most rightful higher  
‘ powers; and insurrections against the one as war-  
‘ rantable as against the other! That monarchy  
‘ has no more warrant in scripture than any  
other



## 6 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

‘ other form of government! That evil means  
 ‘ may be used to a good end! That oaths ob-  
 ‘ lige not in the sense of the imposer, but of the  
 ‘ taker! That bishops may be depriv’d of their  
 ‘ fees by a meer lay-power, &c.’

These, and a great many more of the like strain, are abundantly interspers’d throughout the known writings of *Calvin, Beza, Knox, Goodman, Suarez, Mariana, Parsons, Penry, Buchanan, Leighton, Burton, Calamy, Marshal, Bradshaw, Milton, Goodwin, Ashcam, Harrington, Hobbes, Ludlow, Baxter, Owen, Locke, Sidney, Hunt, Johnson, Tutchin*, and others of the Association, as well Jesuits as Puritan-Rebels and Regicides: not to speak of some moderns of greater note; whom (as a learned divine says) ‘ I forbear to  
 ‘ name, both to avoid the loss of time, which  
 ‘ such a long catalogue would take up, and the  
 ‘ envy which would fall upon me, for naming  
 ‘ some of all professions, who yet live, or whose  
 ‘ memory is yet fresh among (a) us.’ But I cannot omit Mr. *Whiston* (whose *scripture poli-*  
*ticks*

(a) *Hicks’s* serm. 30, *Jan.* 1681, p. 23. And another writer of reputation (speaking of the progress of anti-monarchical principles, in the beginning of this century) says, ‘ They (the faction)  
 ‘ have had their weekly scriblers (I wish I was not obliged to  
 ‘ add some pulpits) to spread this poison: and so far had the infatuation prevail’d, that, a few years since—rebellion was esteem’d  
 ‘ the most necessary requisite to qualify any one for being intrusted in the government—All the principles of 1641 (and even  
 ‘ those of 1648) have been plainly and openly reviv’d—And I  
 ‘ have often question’d with myself, whether the reasonings of  
 ‘ the

*ticks* will fall under a particular examination in the process of this work :) who, tho' he has indeed very fairly dissented from those authors, in some very material points, has however unfortunately entangled himself in several of their principles, which, I am persuaded, will not stand the test of scripture proof.

§ II. As to the original of government in general, he is so far from favouring the popular scheme, that he not only admits, but asserts, and makes it his first fundamental proposition, that 'all just governments, whether ecclesiastical or civil, must be originally deriv'd from *God*—and they do all, some way or other, receive their sanction from divine (a) authority.' This he justly thinks to be so evident to all who believe a *God*, a providence, and the truth of the scriptures, as not to need to be prov'd in particular to them. And 'as for those (says he) who suppose government to have originally sprang up from mere human compacts, and from the people, independently on *God*, and without any regard to his will or authority, they seem to me, to suppose men to have sprung out of the earth, and not to have

' the most celebrated author on this subject might not—be paralleld, paragraph by paragraph, and shewn out of the books and pamphlets of those times, to be the very same, on which the grand rebellion and the murder of the king had been defended, &c.' *Walker's* account of the suffering clergy, 1714. pref. fol. xi.

(a) *Whist. script. polit. p. 1.*

## 8 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

‘ have had God for their creator : and also to suppose that all government has no higher end to aim at, than the conveniencies of this present life, both which things are entirely contrary to religion, and utterly inconsistent with the sacred history of the origin and primitive exercise of government among men. So that this cannot deserve a serious consideration under the present argument of scripture politicks, but must be left to the irreligious schemes of the atheists and unbelievers, ’ (a) &c. So evident is the divine original of government, even by Mr. *Whiston*’s own argument. From which his proposition, it necessarily follows, that no government, whether ecclesiastical or civil, is to be esteem’d a just government, unless it can be originally deriv’d from God, or doth, some way or other, receive its sanction from divine authority.

*Monarchical.* § III. AND as to the particular forms thereof, whoever believes the *Mosaical* (b) account of the creation, and judges impartially of what he reads, cannot doubt that Monarchy was the first and original form of government, and that too instituted immediately by God himself, from the beginning of the world. For, to obviate the false pretences of the Sons of *Be-*  
*lial,*

(a) *Whist. scrip. pol.* (b) *If they hear not Moses, — neither will they be persuaded, tho’ one rose from the dead, St. Luke xvi. 31. And ’tis well observ’d by a Modern Historian, that this of Moses ‘is the only authentick and genuine History of the Creation which has been left us, and carries with it all the marks of truth and probability, even tho’ it be regarded only as a humane composition, and separate from divine authority.’ Univerf. Hist. 1730, fol. 35.*

*lial*, we read there, that the all-wise Creator made but one man at first, and ordain'd that all mankind should proceed from that one ; that (as St. *Chrysostom* observes) *he might teach the world to be governed by a king, and not by a multitude*: neither was the woman herself created at the same time, but afterwards, *out of the man*, for his use, and as an *help meet for (a) him* ; thereby to shew her dependance upon, and subjection to him. And tho' some profane witlings may make light of it, this is the very argument of the Holy Ghost, used by St. *Paul*, to prove the superiority of the man over the (b) woman ; which might alone suffice to confute the *Hobbiſts*. But, besides this foundation in nature, it pleas'd God to add his positive and expreſs command and institution of government, when as yet there were none else but themselves two : for (as the learned bishop *Andrews* (c) expreſſes it) *God gave the man a ſceptre, and made him his vicegerent* ; ſaying unto the woman, *thy deſire ſhall be to thy husband* (or, as it is in our margin, *ſubject to thine husband*,) and *he ſhall rule over thee* (d). Which laſt, being ſpoken after *Adam* had ſinn'd, plainly ſheweth us alſo, that his dominion was not founded in grace ; that is to ſay, in his perſonal virtue, goodneſs, and deſert.

(a) *Gen.* ii. 20, &c. (b) *1 Tim.* ii. 11, 12, 13, and *1 Cor.* xi. 7, &c. (c) *Lect.* fol. 96. (d) *Gen.* iii. 16. which is the very law, to which the apoſtle refers, *1 Cor.* xiv. 34. to prove that the women are commanded to be under obedience.

C

§ IV. WHEN



## 10 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

§ IV. WHEN God had blessed them with children, it pleas'd him, that the father, *Successive, according to birth-right.* by his paternal authority, was sole ruler or monarch over them, and all that proceeded from them, during his life ; ruling them with a power patriarchal, regal, or imperial (a), as every father would and might do, even at this day ; supposing him and his family to fall into any places which were not governed by any superior lord. ' For, as *Adam* was lord of his ' children, so his children under him had a command and power over their own children ; but ' still with subordination to the first parent, ' who is lord paramount over his children's children to all generations, as being the grand-father of his (b) people.' And for the better ordering of the sons and their families, the elder was, by God himself, declared ruler over the younger. For, notwithstanding *Cain* was a very wicked man, and *Abel* a righteous one, inso-much that *the Lord had respect unto Abel, and his offering, but unto Cain, and to his offering, he had not respect* (c) : yet even to this very wicked *Cain* it was, that the Lord, speaking of his good brother *Abel*, said, *unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him* (d), or (as it is in the margin) thou shalt have the excellency, and he shall be subject unto thee ; so that neither was his dominion founded in grace, but in nature only, by virtue of his primogeniture.

Thus

(a) Bishop Overall's convocation book, lib. 1. cap. 2. (b) Filmer's patriarch. p. 12. (c) Gen. iv. 4, 5. (d) — ver. 7.

## *The* REGAL SUCCESSION. 11

Thus 'tis evident, even in holy scripture, that the very first man that ever was born, was born in subjection, as well as all who came after him; that is to say, subject to him who either was naturally the father, patriarch or prince, or else representatively so, by right of primogeniture. How ridiculous therefore and absurd is it in men of liberal education, and how much stronger are their prejudices than their arguments, who can gravely talk of an independent state of mankind by nature! of all men being born equal into the world! and upon such rotten grounds build an argument, that 'there can be no reason, why one 'should have dominion over the rest without their 'consent (a)' &c. I'm willing to hope that Mr. *Whiston* had not this case of *Cain* and *Abel* in his thoughts, when he express'd himself as followeth; We have not, 'that I know of, one 'example, in all the bible, where providence 'gives the least preference to the eldest son, in 'point of government, before the youngest: I 'mean this (says he) barely on account of such 'primogeniture, and without regard to more 'valuable personal qualifications (b):' For nothing can be more clear, than that the more valuable personal qualifications were *Abel's*; and that it was barely on account of primogeniture, that the preference in point of government was given to *Cain* the eldest son. And, as this is full to the purpose, so it ought to have the greater

(a) *Wright's* ass. serm. at *Aylesb.* 15 *MAR.* 1719, p. 5, in 8vo.

b) *Script. polit.* p. 13.

## 12 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

greater weight, for being the first and general rule in those cases ; especially with Mr. *Whiston*, who, but eight pages before, has himself placed this very case among the (not human, but) divine laws ; where he owns, that ‘ it seems to him to ‘ imply, then at least, the inferiority, and in ‘ some degree, the subjection of the younger ‘ children to the elder, while they were under ‘ their parents authority, and in the same family, ‘ even without regard to their virtue (a).’

This is a full concession, that there was such a law or rule, in the beginning, in favour of the eldest son against the younger, in point of government, barely on account of primogeniture ; and that too not human, but divine. But Mr. *Whiston* seems nevertheless to make it a question, whether that law did continue in force afterwards, because of *Cain*’s abuse of that power ? And whether it was a law indeed, or only a particular injunction in a particular case (b) ? Now, that it could be a particular injunction, made in this particular case, I see no reason to suppose : For, if St. *Paul*’s arguing the husband’s authority over the wife, from the case of *Adam* and *Eve*, be a just proof of its being a general law, to continue in force afterwards, (as doubtless it is,) then why should not this of *Cain* and *Abel* be allowed to prove the same of the right of primogeniture ? Neither can I imagine how that author (who builds  
so

(a) *Script. polit.* p. 5.    (b) *Ibid.*

so much of his scripture politicks upon the foundation of personal virtue, goodness and desert) could fancy that *Cain*, whose offerings God would not look upon, should nevertheless be so far in his favour, as to gain the preference in point of government, before his younger brother *Abel*, whose offerings God had graciously accepted; and that too, at the very time, when (God knew) he had premeditated in his heart, to murder his more righteous brother, on account of that very acceptance! Is it possible for him to suppose, that personal virtue, goodness, and desert should preponderate with God, in the disposal of such favours, in all other cases, and yet that *Cain* only should be singled out as a particular object of the divine favour, who had not the least pretence of personal virtue, goodness, and desert, to entitle him thereto? Nay, who was destitute of God's countenance and favour, as St. *Chrysostom* expounds what we call *going out from the presence of the Lord* (a)? But I leave it to the author to reconcile this contradiction! And, since there is no reason to think this to have been only a particular injunction in a particular case, we must receive it for a law or general rule; and conclude, that it did continue in force, notwithstanding *Cain's* abuse of that power, which was not unforeseen by God, when he declared his natural right to the prerogative of primogeniture. But there seems to  
me

(a) Genes. iv. 16.



## 14 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

me much better reason to suppose, that God Almighty, foreknowing the many objections that worldly-minded men would start, in opposition to this divine law, thought fit to declare and affirm it, even in the case of the worst (a) elder brother that ever liv'd. For God does not here bestow upon *Cain* any new privilege, but only confirms unto him what was, by nature, his right; and argues with him the unreasonableness of his discontent, upon principles well known and establish'd from the beginning: as *St. Chrysostom* most truly expounds it; *notwithstanding thou hast thus greatly sinn'd (viz. in not offering to me the first and best of thy substance, as thy brother Abel did,) yet I have not depriv'd thee of the privileges of thy primogeniture; but he shall still be subject to thee, as by the law of nature is thy due.* Agreeably to which, the learned Bishop *Andrews* observeth in this very case, ' That God shewed  
' plain-

(a) Among the many monstrous misapplications of holy scripture, we have seen the case of this first wicked murderer applied to the just execution of notorious rebels, and regicides, by undoubted lawful authority. And particularly, a pretended loyalist, of a new edition, presumes to say, ' that the earth had scarce  
' well drunk in their blood, ere God reviv'd the punishment of  
' *Cain* upon him that shed it, to make him a fugitive and vagabond on the earth, &c. [*Bradbury's* serm. 5 Nov. 1711, p. 19, in 8vo.] As if there were any parallel, between the murder of righteous *Abel*, and the legal execution of *Monmouth* and the other *worthies* (as this unconsecrated preacher calls) his associates!! But we may remember others, who have dar'd to call those who suffer'd for the *Rye-house* conspiracy, *very innocent men*, tho' they confess'd their treason at their deaths!

‘ plainly, that it is his will, that in and by the  
‘ sin committed, no man should lose any privi-  
‘ lege, which of right is due to him, and which  
‘ before he had ; and every motion, in a supe-  
‘ rior, to sin, doth not discharge him of his au-  
‘ thority. Which is contrary to that false opi-  
‘ nion and censure of them, which think, that  
‘ even princes themselves, after sin committed,  
‘ lose all their prerogative and supremacy of  
‘ government which they had before, and that  
‘ their subjects are not bound to do their ser-  
‘ vice any longer to them, but that ever after  
‘ their allegiance shall cease ; which is false, and  
‘ contrary to all reason, and not God’s intent  
‘ and will here. For God saith, and ratifieth  
‘ here, that *Cain*, tho’ he had thus sinned, both  
‘ against God and his Brother ; yet, being the  
‘ elder and first-born. and so before *Abel*, so  
‘ there should be a superiority and dominion,  
‘ that he should still retain by nature. And it is  
‘ God’s assertion, that that superiority should  
‘ be retained still, and that *Abel* should not seek  
‘ to be his superior ; neither did he (a).’ How-  
ever, as this dominion of *Cain* over his brother  
and family, was in subordination to the first  
parent *Adam*, whilst he liv’d : so when he died  
*Cain* himself succeeded in the sovereignty, in  
his own right, as the first-born ; and, after him,  
the eldest surviving branch of the family, by  
virtue

(a) *Andrews’s* lect. fol. 400.

## 16 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

virtue of proximity of blood. (For, as the great *St. Chrysostom* observeth, the line of *Cain*, and with it his primogeniture, was extinct in *Lamech*; that is, at the flood, and not till then :) and hence it came, that the word *Elder* is used, as well for magistracy and power, as for age and gravity, almost in all languages; which, no doubt (as another judicious author observeth) 'is  
' a sign that the first governours were the fa-  
' thers of families, and under them the eldest  
' sons (a).

From hence 'tis clear, that the state of nature (so much talk'd of) was, from the beginning, a state of government and subjection, not of anarchy or independency; and that state of nature confirm'd by the positive institution of God. For the first sovereign rul'd over subjects of his own begetting: and the eldest son succeeding his father in the supreme authority, acquired thereby the title of father of his people; which title, being usually (b) conferr'd on sovereign princes to this day, directly points out to us the original of government, and of monarchy, founded in nature, as well as positive institution. And here our republicans, if they would, might plainly

(a) *Sir Walt. Raleigh*, fol. 151, 152. (b) *Abimelech* was a common title of honour among the Kings of the *Philistines*, signifying *my father the King*; and *Joseph* in *Egypt* was proclaim'd *Abrech*, signifying *the King's father* (as good interpreters assure us;) both which import the same with *pater patriæ*, which was conferr'd by the *Romans* on those who had deserv'd the best, and was generally used by all their Emperors.

plainly perceive, that the patriarchal authority has a 'foundation in nature, so as to render the 'younger brother, upon the father's death, subject to the (a) elder;' tho' several of them have the confidence to treat it with scorn, as an absurd, imaginary and ridiculous notion, and to pervert the very word of God, in hopes to prove it so.

§ V. THUS we see, that *Adam's* monarchy was not only oeconomical, confin'd to that one little family which was at first created, but political over a society, consisting of many families, which were to descend from him, during his long life of *nine hundred and thirty years* (b); (in which time his progeny might well be multiply'd, so as far to exceed the number of people in many of our modern kingdoms; ) which is the very ground and foundation of political government, and particularly of that form thereof, which, from one single person's being the supreme and chief over all the rest, is called monarchy; the power of the monarch increasing in proportion to the number of his descendents and natural-born subjects. And this, by the way, might serve for a full answer to the several assertions of Mr. *Whiston*,  
D That,

*Adam's  
monarchy  
political.*

(a) *Stephens's form.* 30 Jan. 1693. p. 5, 6. (b) *Gen. v. 5.*  
The learned Mr. *Shuckford*, in his connection, vol. i. p. 36. observes that several authors having form'd calculations of the people in the ante-diluvian world, do suppose it to have contained, 'at least two millions of millions of souls; which they think is a number far exceeding that of the inhabitants of the present earth.'



## 18 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

That, ' before the flood, we have no direct ac-  
 ' count of the form or manner of human (a)  
 ' governments: ' as well as to that of Mr. *Wright*,  
 That ' it don't appear, whether there was any  
 ' civil government at all ( before the flood ) or  
 ' no; that there seems to have been none for ma-  
 ' ny years; and that this is notorious, that God  
 ' no where appears in the old testament, to have  
 ' concerned himself in the ordering of any go-  
 ' vernment, till he brought the *Israelites* out of  
 ' *Egypt*, under the conduct of (b) *Moses*: ' and  
 to that of Mr. *Blennerhaysset*, who affirms for  
 certain, ' that God has ordained government in  
 ' general, without specifying any particular (c)  
 ' mode: ' as well as to the appeal of another more  
 celebrated writer, who recommends it to the  
 consciences and common sense of the christian  
 laity, to ' search with their own eyes, and see,  
 ' whether they can possibly find a plain and ex-  
 ' press passage of scripture, in which God insti-  
 ' tuted any particular form of human govern-  
 ' ment, for any nation in the world, unless they  
 ' will except one (d), ' ; of which in its proper  
 place. In the mean time, I beg leave to appeal  
 to the consciences and common sense of all our  
 readers, whether this is not a much more plain  
 and express passage, than any that learned and  
 sincere Author has ever yet produc'd either from  
 scrip-

(a) Script. polit. p. 9. (b) *J. Wright's* ass. serm. at *Ailesb.*  
 15 Mar. 1719, p. 6, 8. (c) *Blennerh.* serm. 20 Jan. 1714, p. 9  
 (d) *Preservat.* against the Nonj. by *B. Bangor*, 1717, p. 13.

scripture, or the laws of *England*, in favour of certain of his darling (a) notions? But supposing we could not find such a plain and express passage, (absolutely and properly!) yet however, since I have abundantly prov'd from divers plain and express passages of scripture, that the monarchical form of human government was founded by God on the law of nature, I may fairly conclude (in the words of the excellent Dr. *Heylin*, against that infamous incendiary *Burton*,) 'positive laws, I trow, are of no such efficacy, 'as to annihilate any thing which hath its being 'and original in the law of (b) nature.' And in return of his appeal, I may presume to put the whole controversy upon this issue, whether he can possibly find a plain and express passage of scripture, in which God instituted any other form of human government for any nation in the world, but only that of monarchy, which he instituted in paradise; or in which he gave authority to any people to chuse their own governours, or to alter the government at their pleasure? As to Mr. *Whiston*, I refer him to his own second general proposition, where he agrees with me expressly, that 'paternal authority over the children of a

D 2

'fami-

(a) The Rev. Dr. *Innes* does not stick to say, that there is neither good sense nor sound divinity, in any or all of those which have been advanc'd in the late preservative and sermon, but that they are, in every respect, fallacious and sophistical! *Innes's* *serm.* of church authority, 2 *June* 1717, p. 14, 15. in 8vo. And the reader may gratify his curiosity further, if he pleases to consult the late Mr. *Luke Milbourne's* *Legacy to the church*, &c. vol. ii 1722. p. 333 (b) *Brief and moder. ans.* 1637, p. 32, 33. in 4to.

‘ family, was the only form of human govern-  
 ‘ ment, among such as sprang from one common  
 ‘ parent, before the multiplication of mankind,  
 ‘ or before their separation, one from another,  
 ‘ into different and distant (a) families:’ And in-  
 ‘ sists, that ‘ this is so plainly the result of the  
 ‘ law of nature, or of the will of God, declar’d  
 ‘ by the common reason of mankind, and con-  
 ‘ firm’d in the bible — that there is no need  
 ‘ of a particular proof. Accordingly (says he)  
 ‘ authority, both ecclesiastical and secular, was  
 ‘ at first, in the same paternal hands, both before  
 ‘ and after the flood; and this for a considerable  
 ‘ time also : as appears in every instance, both  
 ‘ in *Genesis* and *Job* ; which are the only origi-  
 ‘ nal, authentic records, of those first (b) ages.’

And hereditary. § VI. As to the descendants from  
 Adam, we find those of the elder branch  
 first recorded, in a direct line down to the (c)  
 flood, wherein they were all extinguish’d. And  
 then, as if there had never been an elder family,  
 the genealogy of the line of *Seth* begins again  
 with the history of man’s (d) creation, tho’ that  
 had been deliver’d before ; the better to make  
 out the genealogy of *Noah*, who was to continue  
 the succession after the flood, as those had done  
 before it. And yet, tho’ we read, that the pa-  
 triarchs (e)

(a) Script. polit. p. 3. (b) Ibid. p. 4. (c) *Gen.* iv. 17, &c.

(d) — v. 1, &c. (e) These are synonymous titles : as is plain from  
 the holy Scripture; wherein King *David* is called a patriarch, (*Acts*  
 ii. 29,) as the patriarch *Abraham* is call’d a mighty Prince, (*Gen.*  
 xxiii. 6.)

*triarchs* or kings severally begat sons and daughters, we find only the names of the eldest recorded, as the heads and rulers over their respective families and people. But these also growing generally degenerate, through their intercourse with the wicked race of *Cain*, God was provok'd to destroy their common posterity; excepting only *Noah*, who, notwithstanding the fashionable wickedness of the world, *was a just man and perfect (a), and walk'd with God, steadily and zealously, (as St. Chrysostom expresseth it,) not keeping some commandments and breaking others, but of uniform obedience and exact integrity;* and with him was his own family only preserv'd.

§ VII. Now, as before the flood *Adam* had been the universal monarch of the old world, and as such had the sole property of all that was in it, during his life, and after him his heirs in due course of succession; so, after the flood, *Noah* was vested in the like in the new. And whatever share thereof his sons afterwards had, it was all derived from him, and held by his donation and allotment, as being the fountain of all honour and property: and so the same descended to their respective posterity by the like authority, without the least colour of their making any contract or terms with the people their natural-born subjects) whom they were to govern, and consequently without being any way limited by them.

*Noah's monarchy political.*

Here

(a) *Gen. vi. 9.*



## 22 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

Here then it is far from being so evident as some men of character would persuade us, that  
 ‘ in the nature of the thing private property is  
 ‘ before the institution of a settled government,  
 ‘ because (as they argue) the great end of that institution is the preservation of that (a) property.’  
 But I need not engage further in this question, after what has been frequently retorted by much abler hands, and well warranted by the holy scripture. All therefore that I shall say to it here is, that the right (and truly) reverend bishop *Sander-son*, occasionally treating of the pretended contract, which the rebels in his time were wont to plead for, as an argument, that all government was originally deriv’d from the people, (which by the way, he says, *never yet was prov’d, nor, he dares say, will ever be prov’d, while the world standeth, either from scripture, reason, or (b) history,*) toucheth upon this question of property, and expresseth himself thus, ‘ True it is, that a meer rationalist (that  
 ‘ is to say — an atheist of the late edition) who  
 ‘ giveth more faith to such heathen philosophy  
 ‘ as affirmeth the world to have been *ab æterno*,  
 ‘ than to divine revelation which assureth us it  
 ‘ had a beginning; (and some of the great champions of the opinion we now speak of, have given cause enough of suspicion that they are little  
 ‘ better :) such a one, I say, cannot possibly solve  
 ‘ the difficulty. — But to us, who believe the  
 ‘ scrip-

(a) *Preservat. against the Nonjur.* by B. *Bang.* p. 88. (b) *Pref.* to *Archb. Usher’s* power of the prince, &c. sect. xv.

‘ scriptures and acknowledge a creation, the solution — is easy : if we will but follow the clue of the sacred history, in the four first chapters of *Genesis*, it will fairly lead us out of these labyrinths in a plain way, and without any great trouble’. And then he states the case of government and property, to the effect before-mention’d, and concludes, upon the whole, both in *hypothesi*, that *Adam’s* government was before *Cain’s* property, and in *thesi*, that undoubtedly government was before property. ‘ And so (says the bishop) this supposed pact or contract, which maketh such a noise in the world, proveth to be but a squib, powder without shot, that giveth a crack, but vanisheth into air, and doth no execution (a).’ But, to return,

§. VIII. NOAH, living *Three Hundred and Fifty years after the flood* (b), his posterity, according to God’s blessing (c), were during his life, grown exceeding numerous : insomuch, that it was become necessary that some branches from the old stock should be split off, and transplanted into different parts, as well for their more convenient subsistence, as for the better division of the nations ; each of them having authority, to be ruler, over his own people and nation ; and thus *of them was the whole Earth*

*The Nations divided.*

(a) Pref to Archb. *Usher’s* power of the prince, &c. sect. xviii. Whoever is desirous to see this subject treated with the contempt it deserves, may consult a dialogue between *Timothy* and *Philathenus*, vol. iii. p. 117, in 8vo. (b) *Gen.* ix. 28. (c) --ver. 1.

## 24 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

*Earth (a) overspread.* But nevertheless, as the new world was divided and peopled, without the interposition of any human means, by a (*b*) miracle, to demonstrate it to be the act of God himself; so was it done with the greatest, and most exact order imaginable; ' Either by casting of lots, or ' chusing according to the order of their birth- ' right, after some survey taken, of a sufficient ' portion of the earth, and portions bordered out ' according to the number of their nations, then ' of their (*c*) families, &c. ' God thus turning that which was impos'd as a judgment on them, to the benefit of the world: for, at the same time, that God almighty dispersed the people, by confounding their tongues at *Babel*, he did not leave them, every one to shift for himself: but it pleas'd him to give to every several tribe, or branch of them,

(*a*) Gen. ix. 19. (*b*) Mr. *Shuckford* has very ingeniously attempted to account for this in a natural way; tho' (he owns) the writers generally suppose it to have been the effect of a miracle. But, I think, one of his own considerations is enough to overthrow all the rest; viz. that ' Nothing less than a very extraordinary miracle could ' have sorted them,' in so regular a manner as we shall find they were. See *Shuckf. connect.* vol. i. p. 146. (*c*) *Jos. Mede's works*, fol. 274. The learned Mr. *Selden* mentions a tradition generally received from the oriental writers, that *Noah*, (having been made lord of the whole earth by God himself) made a will by direction from God, whereby all the then known world was divided among his sons and their progeny. (*Selden de jure nat. & gent.* tom. i. col. 606. & de *Synedr.* tom. i. col. 773.) And further, that he exacted an oath of them, that none of them should usurp upon another's right. (*Idem de jure nat. &c.* col. 663. & de *Synedr.* col. 1033. *Idem etiam in mari clauso.* tom. ii. col. 1195. & de *successionibus*, col. 61, 62. edit. *Wilk.*

## the REGAL SUCCESSION. 25

them, a distinct (a) language; so that it was natural for them to settle together for the benefit of conversation and commerce: and whoever was the eldest of the tribe was of course, by the laws of God and nature, the head and ruler thereof; enjoying that honour by birth-right, and not by election. 'For, in those days, they knew no other right of government, but what was natural and (b) paternal: ' so that it is a groundless suggestion of a late author, that 'Perhaps, in some nations, from the confusion of tongues, it was the people's part, to chuse who should rule over (c) them'. Nay, the Lord himself, interposing his authority, appointed them their several bounds, as well as their rulers. For, as *Moses* tells us, *When the most high divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people, according to the number of the children of (d) Israel; or (as it is render'd in the Greek,) according to the number of the angels; meaning their rulers, who are elsewhere in holy scripture, frequently stiled Gods: so also the son of Syrach assures us, In the divisions of the nations of the whole earth, he set a ruler over every (e) people; from*

E whence

(a) Mr. *Parker* reports from antient authorities, that *Heber*, the son of *Arphaxad*, not consenting to the building of *Babel*, his language remain'd unchang'd; so that his descendants always retain'd their proper speech and dialect: *Biblioth. Bib.* p. 278. (b) *Sherlock's* serm. 29 May, 1685, p. 6. (c) Disc. of God's ways of dispos. of kingdoms, 1691, p. 9. (d) *Deuter.* xxxii. 8. (e) *Ecclus.* xvii. 17. And here 'tis remarkable, that this was one of the



## 26 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

whence 'tis plain, that political government (and that too under the form of hereditary monarchies) was by divine institution, as I have already observ'd, tho' certain persons would fain persuade us, that forms of government are only of human determination! For from these rulers (whose names are recorded to the number of seventy) their respective kingdoms descended in an hereditary course of succession. Notwithstanding all which, there are some not asham'd to assert, that 'tho' 'God was pleas'd to order that (dispersion at 'Babel) we do not find the least intimation of 'his interposing to set up rulers among 'em; 'which therefore must be understood to have 'been left to their own (a) choice!'

Thus were the nations of the earth divided, among the posterity of *Noah*, every one after his tongue, after their families, in their (b) nations: many of which nations are known by their names to this day; as may be seen by comparing together the several chapters noted in the (c) margin: and, in all these, did the several patriarchs, by virtue of their paternity and eldership, exercise a regal power, and that too in the most full and absolute manner; as will be shewn hereafter, in its proper place. Would it not therefore raise a just indignation in any one who pays a due regard

the most general traditions among the *Jews*, descending from father to son, and never to be forgotten; as is plain from *Deut.* xxxi. 19, &c. and xxxii. 7. (a) *J. Wright's serm. at Aylesb.* 15 *Mar.* 1719, p. 7. (b) *Gen.* x. 5. (c) *Gen.* x. *Isa.* lxvi. *Jer.* li. *Ezek.* xxvii. xxxviii.

gard to the word of God, to hear the children of this world ridiculing this natural and divine order of succession, as an absurd opinion! a fatal system! a fantastical scheme, &c. As if, according to this patriarchal system, no prince whatsoever could have a just right to government unless he could prove himself to be the 'eldest son of the right branch, even from (a) *Noah*? or 'Adam's heir in a direct (b) line!' But what wiser schemes do they give us in the room of these? Why; they lay the foundation of all government upon no firmer ground than a pretended common consent, and that absurdity of an original contract, herein before exploded: 'but, if you ask them when, and where, and by whom, or how this pact or covenant was made or consented to, you will find them as silent, or at least speak as little to the purpose as the man in the (c) moon.'

§ IX. I SHOULD not need to examine Nimrod's the succession or title of *Nimrod*, and usurpation. the other Kings of the nations; my present enquiry being chiefly confined to the holy seed of *Shem*. But, since in him we are said to find 'an intimation of the origin of kingly or monarchical (d) government,' I think it may be proper,

E 2

after

(a) *Hoadly's* serm. at *Hertsf.* 22 Mar. 1707, p. 13, in 8vo.  
 (b) *J. Wright's* serm. at *Aylesb.* 15 Mar. 1719, p. 6. (c) *Forense's* serm. at *Manch.* 9 Sept. 1683, p. 13. (d) *Whist.* script. polis. p. 10. This is indeed the common opinion: but (as the learned *Selden* observes) 'there is reason enough to conjecture, that there were kings also long before both him and the flood.'  
*Seld.*

## 28 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

after what I have already said on that subject, to observe, that if, 'at the first, the fathers of nations were as Kings, and the eldest of families 'as (a) princes,' as is own'd by the author whom Mr. *Whiston* himself quotes to his purpose, then, by consequence, the origin of kingly or monarchical government could not be in the person of *Nimrod*, nor from the people, but from God only. No doubt, he was by good right, and just authority, Lord or King over his own family, as the other heads of families were: but, if he was not content with his own natural sovereignty, but enlarg'd his dominion, by violently invading, and seizing on the rights of other lords of families, whom he thereby drove out or made subject to his empire, (as 'tis generally suppos'd) it was against all natural right; and consequently can't be esteem'd the origin of kingly government,

*Seld. Titl. of Hon.* 1726, vol. iii, col. 110. Where having mention'd *Cain's* building a city, &c. and quoted authority to prove that *Adam* himself govern'd or commanded all mankind, as long as he lived, &c. he proceeds thus; 'and besides (says he) we see in those of the following times, who have left us fuller testimonies of particular forms of government, that monarchy hath continually been, 'and to this day is, not less generally admitted and establish'd in 'all nations, than as if it were deriv'd out of the law of nature 'which doubtless was not less follow'd in those many ages before 'Nimrod, than it hath been since him:' *ibid.* col. 111. Nay, he afterwards positively affirms that, about the time of *Nimrod*, 'there was so general a propagation of this title of King over 'the earth, that there is scarce a nation, whereof there is memory in these ages, without a king, or prince, or monarch by 'name assign'd to it,' &c. *ibid.* col. 117. (a) *Raleigh's hist* fol. 151.

ment, but an usurpation ; which our author may make a precedent of, whenever he happens to have occasion for such a one ! And as to his subsequent observation, that ‘ this settlement was not made ‘ by any particular direction from God, but by ‘ interest, and desert, and abilities, and the voluntary submission of the people, (a) &c. ’ I see no conclusion to be drawn from thence, more natural than this, that supposing a prince to have interest, and desert, and abilities, and the voluntary submission of the people too, (tho’, by the way, nothing of this appears in *Nimrod’s* case, but rather the contrary : for as there is not here any colour of proof that he was chosen by the people, so the very phrase of calling him a *mighty hunter*, being ‘ a form of speech among the ‘ *Hebrews*, whereby they signify a spoiler or oppressor (b), ’ plainly implies, that he could hardly be so much entitled to their favour ;) yet, if he be set up without any particular direction from God, and against his written laws, as well as the law of nature, he can be but an usurper still, as *Nimrod* was. And therefore, whether he were the youngest son of *Cush*, as Mr. *Whiston* (c) supposes, or, whether he is mention’d alone (according to St. *Augustine*, and other commentators only as being the most eminent person, and to take occasion to touch his tyranny, I shall not dispute : all that I shall add, is a remark of a  
learned

(a) *Whist. script. polit. p. 10, 11.* (b) *Hayward against Dolman, p. 29, 30.* (c) *Whist. script. polit. p. 11.*



## 30 The SHORT HISTORY of

learned modern, that ‘this *Nimrod* was for certain (a) the *Belus* of the antients; and this compellation, most probably, was not originally from his birth, but was afterwards given him, because of his rebellion against *Noah*, and his alteration of the patriarchal way of government, with the true old religion: for he was properly *Tyrannus sine titulo*; as could be made appear, on several accounts, even to demonstration: whence he might be called *Bel* (or *Baal*) for his dominion, and *Nimrod* for his rebellion; as the learned Dr. *Prideaux* well (b) remarks.’

However, that even among the nations too, the same authority was maintain’d, according to the law of nature, or common consent of mankind, will appear from a few hints laid together, before we come to the close of this History; to which I refer the reader, whilst I proceed here, with the succession of those who were within the pale of the church: among whom the paternal or patriarchal power continu’d, till the *Egyptian* bondage; where the exercise of the patriarchal jurisdiction was intermitted, only because they were all in subjection to a stronger prince, and that too in his own country.

§ X. BUT, to be somewhat more particular, *Shem* we find, is entitl’d *the father of all the children of*

(a) Mr. *Shuckford* (connect. vol. i, p. 182, 191, &c.) endeavours to prove *Belus* rather the successor of *Nimrod*: but that I shall leave to the critics. (b) *Parker’s* biblioth. bibl. vol. i, p. 271, 272; where he quotes *Prideaux’s* connect. par. i. lib. ii, p. 100, edit. i.

of Eber (a) : whereby, the scripture informs us, (as St. Augustine (b) observes) that he was reputed the patriarch of all that were to descend from him, sons, grandsons, great grandsons, &c. And St. Jerom (c) notes, that from his sons, who, upon the dispersion, became heads, several large nations proceeded : as from *Elam*, the *Elamites*, princes of *Persia* ; from *Assur*, the *Assyrians* ; from *Arphaxad*, the *Chaldeans* ; from *Lud*, the *Lydians* ; and from *Aram* the *Syrians* (whose metropolis is *Damascus*) ; all great monarchies. It does not therefore seem very material, whether *Shem* or *Japhet* was the eldest son of *Noah*. But, because some people take it for granted, (and lay great stress upon it,) that *Shem* was preferr'd before his elder brother, 'tis worth our notice, that the text (d) on which their objection is grounded, instead of *Shem* the brother of *Japhet* the elder (as we have it in our translation) ought to be render'd *Shem* the elder brother of *Japhet* (according to some very good criticks ; ) so that it will be clear, that *Shem* was *maximus filius*

(a) Gen. x. 21. (b) Civit. Dei, l. 16, c. 3, col. 417. (c) Quæst. Hebr. col. 517. Besides which the learned Mr. Parker before quoted, shews from good authorities, that from *Gomer* descended the *Gamerenses* or *Galatians* ; from *Madai*, the *Medes* and *Sarmatians* ; from *Javan*, the *Jonians* ; from *Tiras*, the *Thracians* and *Trojans* ; from *Canaan*, the *Canaanites* ; from *Seba*, the *Sabeans* ; from *Sidon*, the *Sidonians* ; from *Heber*, the *Hebrews*, &c. see the bibliotheca biblica on *Genesis*, compar'd with *Shuckford's* connection, vol. i. p. 151, &c. who has given us a curious map of the several countries thus peopled. (d) Gen. x. 21.

## 32 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

*filius Noæ*, as St. *Augustine* and others expressly call him. But, whether he was the same person with *Melchisedec* King of *Salem* (as Mr. *Selden*, *Broughton*, and others do assert,) I shall leave to the more curious reader's enquiry.

Of A- § XI. IN this genealogy, is plainly  
bram. deduc'd the descent of (a) *Abram*, from whom the stream of scripture-succession runs on in an opener channel, than it did before : and that he was unquestionably a monarch by divine right, appears from his being expressly call'd, by God himself, to possess a kingdom entail'd upon him and his heirs *for ever* (b).

*Isaac.* § XII. To him succeeded *Isaac* his son and heir of all that he had (c). And yet so industrious are some people to seek out for objections against the doctrine of hereditary succession, as to pretend, that the very case now before us is a good argument against it ; because *Ishmael* was born before *Isaac*, tho' the latter was preferr'd before him : for the better colouring of which 'tis urg'd, that probably *Hagar* was married to *Abram*, and her son *Ishmael* was born in (d) wedlock. But, since *Sarah* was undoubtedly married to *Abram*, and *Hagar* (at best) but probably so, 'tis no sufficient proof that *Ishmael* had the right of inheritance by primogeniture. Be-  
sides

(a) *Gen.* xi. 26. (b) *Gen.* xii. 1, &c — xii. 1, 15, &c. — xv. 7. &c. — xvii. 8. — xxvi. 4. *Acts* vii. 5. (c) *Gen.* xv. 4. — xvii. 15, &c. — xxi. 12. — xxxv. 5. — xxxvi. 3, &c.  
(d) *Page's serm.* 30. *Jan.* 1714. p. 7, 8.

sides the holy scripture itself expressly calls *Isaac* the *only son of (a) Abraham*: which must be understood of the only son born in wedlock; because he had several other sons (besides *Ishmael*) born of (b) concubines, meaning for certain those born of *Hagar* and *Keturah*, according to a learned (c) annotator: and moreover, the Angel calling *Hagar* still *Sarah's (d) maid*, and commanding her to submit herself to her mistress, seems plainly to prove the same. But supposing *Ishmael* had been the undoubted natural heir, yet 'tis plain, that *Isaac* was preferr'd by the express revelation and appointment of God himself, who is the only absolute sovereign over all rights and laws whatsoever: and therefore, tho' we dare not presume to question the (e) legality of God's own act (when thus manifestly reveal'd;) yet neither does it seem to us a sufficient warrant to do the like, without the like express authority from God, (any more than the known cases of *Abraham* and the *Israelites* would warrant us to sacrifice a son, or rob our neighbours!) and much less therefore can it be agreed, that 'a divine example is not only a sufficient justification of our actions, but is set down for our imitation; and therefore, not to imitate it 'would be (f) sin,' as some new casuists would persuade us. *Isaac's* case however affords us a much better argument against the advocates for

F

resi-

(a) *Gen.* xxii. 2, 16. (b) *Gen.* xxv. 6. (c) *Biblio. h. bib.* p. 538.  
(d) *Gen.* xvi. 8, 9. (e) *Page's serm.* 20 Jan. 1714, p. 17, 8.  
(f) *Blakeway's serm.* 1715, p. 5.



## 34 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

resistance: one of whom having observ'd, that  
 ' in all relations, where the foundation is taken  
 ' away, the relation and the obligations arising  
 ' out of it are destroy'd,' proceeds to argue thus ;  
 ' The relation of children to a parent arises out  
 ' of his conveying being to them: but, if he  
 ' goes about to destroy that being, they are ac-  
 ' quitted when they defend (a) themselves ;' that  
 is to say, (if he means any thing by a forcible  
 resistance. But, to suppose the very worst ; in  
 case a parent goes about to destroy the being  
 of his child, does that take away the relation be-  
 tween them, and destroy the obligation arising  
 out of it? He durst not say that : and therefore  
 shuffles it off with an apology for self-defence ;  
 which no body denies, provided there be no in-  
 jury or violence done to the parent. But can the  
 child, even in such a case of the last necessity, be  
 acquitted, if he kills his parent for his own de-  
 fence? Surely, if ever any, *Isaac* might have thus  
 been acquitted: and yet 'tis plain, that tho' he  
 was at least three and thirty years of age, and  
 so capable of making (b) resistance against his  
 aged father, when alone with him, he did not  
 think himself at liberty to resist his authority, but  
 signaliz'd his love of duty above his own (c) life ;  
 for which he is justly extoll'd by the primitive  
 fathers, as chusing to be a martyr, rather than a  
 rebel. And if the authority of our natural pa-  
 rents

(a) *Burnet's serm. at Salisb. 5 Nov. 1710, p. 10, in 8vo.*  
 (b) *Howel's hist. of the bib. vol. 1, 1716, p. 54.* (c) *Biblioth.*  
*bib. p. 484.*

rents be so sacred and irresistible, it seems not easy to shew, how that of our natural sovereign should become less so; tho' some of our modern doctors would make children and subjects, both witnesses, jurors, judges and executioners, in their own cause.

§ XIII. To *Isaac* his eldest son *Esau* was heir (a) apparent: but, as he, by his own act, and that too, *that the purpose of God, according to election might* (b) stand, did transfer his birth-right to his younger brother *Jacob*, there is no reason to question the lawfulness of the alienation. Yet we do not read, that ever *Esau* paid any personal service, or own'd any subjection to *Jacob*: but on the contrary we see, that *Jacob* meeting him, *bowed himself to the ground seven times*, calling *Esau* his lord, and himself his servant (c); in token of a natural allegiance by birth, even after his sale of the birth-right. And so we read of eight kings of the posterity of *Esau*, who *reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any King over the children of* (d) *Israel*; whose successors were conquer'd by *David* (e) of the house of *Judah*, as had been (f) foretold by the lord: and those were so far from owning any subjection to the posterity of *Jacob*, that they refused them a *passage through* their (g) dominions.

But, be that as it will, we may learn by this case, that *Jacob* was not possess'd of the prerogatives

F 2

(a) *Gen.* xxv. 25, &c. (b) *Rom.* xi. 11. (c) *Gen.* xxxiii.  
(d) *Gen.* xxxvi. 31. and 1 *Chron.* i. 43. (e) 2 *Sam.* viii. 14.  
(f) *Gen.* xlix. 8. (g) *Numb.* xx. 21.

## 36 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

gatives of primogeniture meerly by the providence of God (as certain people affect to call it, meaning his secret will, without, or contrary to his revealed will,) but by the express revelation of God, attended with his elder brother's grant; and that too confirm'd by their natural superiour, the patriarch *Isaac* himself. In which act of ratification, 'tis very remarkable, that the patriarch, pronouncing the blessing upon his first-born (as he intended it,) said, *be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee (a)*, &c. And tho' he was afterwards convinc'd, that he had mistaken the person, yet when he says of *Jacob*, who was then confirm'd, in the prerogative, *I have made him thy lord, and all his brethren have I given to him for servants (b)*, &c. it shews what was 'strictly and 'directly the *jus primogeniti*, the right of the first-born (c), tho' then alienated as aforesaid. However, as this purpose was manifestly prior to either of their births, and consequently (as the apostle argues) before they had *done any good or evil (d)*, it is plain, that *God's dealing in the case* can't truly be said to have been *preponderated by personal virtue, goodness and desert (e)*, unless we could suppose, that *Jacob* was personally virtuous, good and deserving before he was born, or that he was capable of *procuring by his good behaviour, or his brother of for-*  
*feiting*

(a) *Gen.* xxvii. 29. (b) — ver. 37. (c) *Biblioth. bib.* p. 584.

(d) *Rom.* ix. 11. (e) *Whist.* script. polit. p. 12, 13.

feiting by his ill conduct, before either of them had done any good or evil: neither did it please God, that his elder brother (even wicked *Eſau*) should be actually defeated of the blessing, without his own motion and voluntary act; which was truly and properly an abdication (there being no sufficient force (a) put upon him, to oblige him thereto,) concurrent with the purpose of God. So much did he favour the claim of birth-right, as a foundation for civil superiority and dominion, contrary to that author's observation.

§ XIV. As the birth-right (b) was thus <sup>Judah.</sup> vested in *Jacob* by the Lord, so was it afterwards translated, by the same authority, from *Reuben*, his eldest son, to *Judah* the fourth (c); tho' *Judah* himself was an incestuous person, as evidently as *Reuben*; so that his dominion was not founded in grace! neither can it be said with any propriety, that inward and personal virtues obtain'd for *Judah*, what his elder brother had

(a) Thus the famous Bishop *Burnet* explains it, when (speaking of the late King *James*;) he says, 'certainly the withdrawing, upon the apprehension of danger to his person, could be no more called an abdication, than King *Charles* the second's going beyond the seas after *Worcester* fight.' Serm. at *Salisbury*. 5 *Novem.* 1710, p. 12, in 8vo. (b) Mr. *Shuckford* mentions a tradition among the *Jews*, that 'before the tabernacle, whilst private altars were in use, the eldest or first-born was the sacrificer or priest of the family,' (when the father himself was not with them;) and it is for this reason, that *Eſau* was called *prophane*, (*Hebr.* xii. 16.) for selling his birth-right, because he shewed himself to have but little value for that religious office which was annex'd to it.' *Shuckf. connect.* p. 296. (c) *Gen.* xlix. 8. — xxxviii. 18.



### 38 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

had forfeited *for his wickedness* (a) : unless *Judah's* defiling his daughter in law, were a virtue, and a meritorious act in him, by the same law as *Reuben's* defiling his father's concubine was an unpardonable sin ! And besides, so far is this case from being an evidence to the prejudice of the primogeniture, (as our popular advocates would fain persuade us) that this very forfeiture, which they urge against it, plainly implies a natural right to the preheminance inherent in the eldest by birth, till such forfeiture ; for a man cannot forfeit any thing that he had not a prior right to. And so doubtless Mr. *Whiston* himself understood it, when he said, that *Joseph*, ' had a double portion allotted him by his father, in the division ' of the land of *Canaan*,—, which indeed should ' have belonged to *Reuben* the first born (b). ' And accordingly we find, that *Reuben* is so far favour'd on account of his primogeniture, that he, as the first-born, is still honour'd by their father, as his might, the beginning of his strength, *the excellency of dignity; and the excellency of power* (c) ; *the two peculiar characters* of sovereignty, (as the learned archbishop (d) *Usher* calls them,) and in regard thereof, he and his sons are usually first named in the (e) genealogies, and that too with a reason grounded even in nature.

But here, by the way, I must make a stand, to admire at some men, who, with seeming gravity, tell

(a) *Whist. Script. polit.* p. 14, 15. (b) *Ibid.* p. 15. (c) *Gen.* xlix. 3. (d) *Usher's power of the prince, &c.* p. 14, 1710. (e) *Exod.* vi. 14. *Numb.* i. 5, 20. 1 *Chron.* v. 1.

tell us, that ‘ a right by law should be (if possible) more precious to us than a right by succession, since fortuitous birth giveth a right by succession, but ’tis the addition of heroic merit to princely birth which recommends to a right by (a) law:’ and would persuade us, that ‘ God himself puts little value upon primogeniture, or the like accidental privileges, even in matters of government, in comparison of those inward and personal virtues, which make men worthy of, and fit for such important (b) employments:’ and pretend to somewhat of a *national right*, as being *more divine than that of (c) nature*. As if the primogeniture of children was merely fortuitous or accidental! or as if the author of nature himself did not know better than we (who are apt to judge according to our own weak notions, strong prejudices, or partial interests,) which child would be best fitted for such employments as he designs them to by their respective birth and succession! or as if there could be any right more divine than that of nature; except in cases where God himself has been pleased to manifest his interposition, to over-rule that by his express revelation. Surely, since *children are an heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is his (d) reward*, their primogeniture ought not to be call’d fortuitous or accidental, by men who regard the holy scripture: at least, they might have learnt from a late prelate (whose judg-

(a) *W. Stephens’s* serm. before the L. Mayor, &c. 16 Apr. 1696. p. 22. in 4to. (b) *Whist. Script. polit.* p. 15. (c) *Page’s* serm. 20 Jan. 1714, Ep. dedic. (d) *Psal. cxxvii.* 3.

judgment is of great authority with them on other occasions,) that 'there is nothing more sacred  
 ' among men, than a right of inheritance: but  
 ' for the derivation of that right to their per-  
 ' sons, they owe it only to God; for it comes  
 ' to them by their birth, and they owe their birth  
 ' only to (a) God.' But, to return to the case of  
*Reuben*; tho' his unnatural transgression render'd  
 him justly liable, before God, to a forfeiture of  
 his natural privileges, yet we find, that he was not  
 defeated of, or excluded from, his hereditary right,  
 by his brethren or neighbours, much less by his  
 children, subjects and servants, but by his father  
 and lawful sovereign: and that by the immediate  
 inspiration of God Almighty himself, who ex-  
 pressly entail'd the sceptre upon *Judah*, to conti-  
 nue in his heirs till *Shiloh* (b) should come; so  
 that this case can be of no use to the patrons  
 of popular schemes.

§ XV. AFTER this, comes in ano-  
 Joseph. ther of Mr. *Whiston's* objections against  
 the divine right of primogeniture; tho' I need  
 but just mention it. He asserts, that '*Joseph*  
 ' was preferr'd before the rest, on account of  
 ' his goodness, and particularly his unspotted  
 ' chastity, by divine providence (c), &c.' I grant,  
 that

(a) Bishop *Lloyd's* disc. of God's ways of disposing of Kingd.  
 1691, p. 16, in 4to. (b) *Gen.* xlix. 10. *Shiloh* was our blessed  
 Saviour, of whom this was an acknowledg'd prophesy. Now  
 this sceptre was given to *David* of the tribe of *Judah*, 1 *Chron.*  
 xxviii. 4. and ordain'd to continue hereditary, from *Solomon* down-  
 wards, in the eldest son; which was the known rule in that king-  
 dom. (c) *Script. polit.* p. 15.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION. 41

that his chastity was very eminent, and that he was highly favour'd by God Almighty : but cannot say, that he was by divine Providence preferr'd on that particular account, without, in some measure, impeaching the divine right of *Solomon*, and many other princes, in all ages, less exemplary for that excellent virtue.

§ XVI BUT, to proceed. When *Jacob*, by divine inspiration, preferr'd the younger of *Joseph's* children, before the elder, <sup>Ephraim.</sup> their father was *displeas'd*. For he was sensible, the law and order of nature could not be alter'd by any human power, and he did not then perceive, that what his father did proceeded from the Lord : And therefore he *beld up his father's band, to remove it from Ephraim's head to Manasse's head* ; and *Joseph said unto his father, Not so, my father ! for this is the first-born, put thy right band upon his head (a)* ; which plainly shews us the great regard that was due to the primogeniture in those days, and that the law of nature and natural rights, was the same then, as it was before, and still continues.

§ XVII. Now, this law of nature is indeed the eternal law of the Creator, infus'd into <sup>The law</sup> the heart of the creature, at the time <sup>of nature.</sup> of the creation : by which law mankind were govern'd two thousand years, before any laws were written ; whereof the apostle says, *the Gentiles which have not the law, do, by nature, the things*

G

con-

(a) *Gen.* xlviii. 17, 18.



## 42 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

*contained in the law ; these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves (a).*

Thus, in a word, not only *Adam*, but all the succeeding patriarchs, as well before, as after the flood, had, by this law of nature, royal authority over their respective children, and exercised kingly power, in full and ample manner. For so we find them raising armies ; making solemn treaties of peace ; sending formal embassies on negotiations of marriage ; adjudging offenders to death ; and granting pardons after such condemnation (*b*) : and, 'tis remarkable, that in *Abraham's* treaty, with the sons of *Heth*, for a burying-place for *Sarah*, they stile him *a mighty prince* (*c*) ; as indeed he was.

What has been here said, was well summ'd up by an author, who had formerly been justly censur'd, for what he had partially written in favour of some pretended privileges of the people. 'The  
' original law of nature (says he), as all politicians  
' and divines assert, and the scripture manifests,  
' at first gave every father a magistratical and  
' judicial rule, power, over his children, progeny,  
' family, and made him a king, prince, lord  
' over them, without either their choice or call :  
' the father, and first-born of the family, being  
' both the king, prince, lord over it, and priest  
' to it, from the creation, till the law was given ;  
' as is generally acknowledg'd by all divines ;  
' as God himself is king over all the earth, world,  
' as

(a) *Rom.* ii. 14.

(b) *Gen.* xiv. — xxi. 31. — xxvi. 31.

— xxiv. 2. — xxxviii. 24, 26. (c) *Gen.* xxiii. 6.

‘ as Creator and father (a) thereof’. And the celebrated Mr. *Selden*, in fewer words, tells us, that ‘ civil society, beginning first in particular families, under oeconomick rule, representing what is now a commonwealth, had, in its state, the husband, father and master, as (b) king.’

Since then ’tis so evident, that all the patriarchs had this regal power, what hinders, but that they should be esteemed kings, to all intents and purposes? nay, and as absolute too, as any have been since?

If there yet remains any doubt of it, let us hear the Lord Chief Justice *Coke* (that great oracle of the law!) who assures us, from most unexceptionable authorities, that ‘ certain it is, that before judicial, or municipal laws were (c) made, kings did decide causes according to natural equity, and were not tied to any rule or formality of law, but did *dare jura* (d): that magistracy and government are of nature (e): that it appeareth by demonstrative reason, that ligeance, faith and obedience of the subject to the sovereign, was before any municipal or judicial laws: 1. For that government and subjection were long before any municipal or judicial laws; 2. For that it had been in vain to have

G 2

‘ pre-

(a) *Pryn's* plea for the lords, p. 10, where he proves all this by the authorities of *Aristotle*, *Bodin*, *Field*, *Selden*, and the holy scriptures. (b) *Selden's* works, tom. 3, col. 927. (c) *Viz.* For two thousand years, before *Moses's* time; as before in p. 41. (d) *Coke's* reports, part. 7. *postnati*, *Calvin's* case, 6. Jac. 1. fol. 13. and 17, b. (e) *Ibid.* fol. 13.

#### 44 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

‘ prescrib’d laws to any but to such as ow’d obe-  
 ‘ dience, faith and ligeance before, in respect  
 ‘ whereof they were bound to obey and observe  
 ‘ them (a): that this is within that command-  
 ‘ ment of the moral law, *honora patrem*; which  
 ‘ doubtless doth extend to him that is *pater patriæ*  
 ‘ (b): that, to this *pater patriæ*, this sovereign  
 prince by birth, a true and faithful obedience of  
 the subject is due, by the law of nature; and ‘an  
 ‘ incident inseparable to every subject; for, as  
 ‘ soon as he is born he oweth, by birthright, li-  
 ‘ geance and obedience to his sovereign’ (c):  
 And that, such as (he says) is *without limitation,*  
*condition, bounds, or reserve* (d): that this allegi-  
 ance is due to the King; and to him only, and  
 (e) always; and that in regard of his natural per-  
 son (f), and not by reason of his (g) crown:  
 that this law of nature is part of the law ‘ of  
 ‘ *England* (h); where the King holdeth the king-  
 ‘ dom, by birthright inherent, by descent from  
 ‘ the blood royal, whereupon succession doth at-  
 ‘ tend: and therefore, it is usually said, to the  
 ‘ King, his heirs, and successors; wherein heirs  
 ‘ is first named, and successor is attendant upon  
 ‘ heirs:

(a) *Ibid.* (b) Fol. 12, b. (c) *Ibid.* fol. 4, b. 12, b. and  
 13. (d) *Ibid.* fol. 10. *Ligeantia naturalis nullis claustris coer-*  
*cetur, nullis metis refranatur, nullis finibus premittur.* (e) *Ibid.*  
 fol. 12. (f) *Ibid.* fol. 10. (g) *Ibid.* fol. 11. This was the  
*damnable and damned opinion* (as our author calls it) of the *Spens-*  
*ers*, upon which they inferred execrable and detestable principles  
 (like some of those mention’d in § 1.); all which were condemned  
 by two parliaments, under K. Edw. II. and Edw. III. (h) *Ibid.*  
 fol. 4, b. and 2, b.

' heirs: and yet in our ancient books, succession  
 ' and successor are taken for hereditance and  
 ' heirs—: but the Title is by descent. (For ex-  
 ' ample) by Queen *Elizabeth's* death, the crown  
 ' and kingdom of *England* descended to his ma-  
 ' jesty (King *James*, tho' then *out of this kingdom*):  
 ' and he was fully and absolutely thereby King,  
 ' without any essential ceremony, or act, to be  
 ' done *ex post facto*; for coronation is but a royal  
 ' ornament, and outward solemnization of the  
 ' royal descent, but no part of the title' (a):  
 that such ' allegiance, being due by the law of  
 ' nature, is immutable, inherent, and insepara-  
 ' ble; and cannot be respited, alter'd or chang'd,  
 ' much less taken away (b)':

This

(a) *Ibid.* fol. 10. b. As was clearly resolved by all the judges  
 of *England*, in the case of *Watson and Clarke*, 1 *Jac.* 1. And ap-  
 peareth evidently by infinite precedents and book-cases (here cited  
 fol. 11.) by which it manifestly appeareth, that by the laws of  
*England* there can be no *interregnum* within the same. And (as  
 Dr. *Burnet* says, of the form of the coronation of K. *Edw.* VI.  
 ' he being declar'd the rightful and undoubted heir, both by the  
 ' laws of God and man, they (the people) were desir'd to give  
 ' their good wills and assents to the same, as by their duty of  
 ' allegiance they were bound to do.' *Burn.* hist. reform. vol. 2,  
 fol. 13. Which further illustrates that true reading of Sr. *Rob.*  
*Holbourne* upon the statute of treasons; who says, *the King is*  
*crown'd because he is a King, and not a King because he is*  
*crown'd.* (b) *Coke's Rep.* as before, fol. 4, b. 7, b. 12, b. 13, b.  
 Upon these grounds Dr. *Story* was convicted in Q. *Elizabeth's*  
 time, tho' he pleaded, that he had *translated his allegiance* to the  
 K. of *Spain*, and therefore was not her subject. ' But this being  
 ' contrary to his natural allegiance, which he could never shake  
 ' off,



## 46 The SHORT HISTORY of

This quotation, from so great an assertor of the subjects privileges (and in a case too, which was 'as elaborately, substantially, and judiciously 'argu'd, by the lord chancellor and all the judges 'of *England*, (none of which, I believe, was 'thought to be popishly-affected) as ever was '(a) any': and which has this peculiar to it, that 'no one opinion, in all our books, is against 'this judgment,' (b) cannot need an apology especially to our lawyers, (among whom 'tis a maxim, that *no man ought to think himself wiser than the laws*;) since it has given us so clear a light into the law of nature (by which mankind were originally govern'd), in relation to the paternal and regal authority of the patriarchs, which has been so prophanelly and absurdly ridicul'd; and of which I may say, 'as Dr. *Sherlock* said of non-

'off, he was found guilty of treason, and executed': As 'tis related by the same Dr. *Burnet*; (who had good reason to study this point.) *Hist. Reform.* vol. 2. fol. 396. For 'tis roundly asserted, as well by divines as lawyers, that a natural-born subject 'can no more 'dissolve, change or transfer this obligation, by a subsequent protestation of his obedience to a prince or state, other than his natural, than he could, afore he came into the world, chuse of 'what parents he would descend, the country where, and the 'dominion under which he would make his entrance into it.' *Fitz-William's* serm. 9. Sept. 1683, p. 16. See also the *Act of Succession* pass'd in *Scotland*, 13 Aug. 1681, printed in Dr. *Hickes's* pref. to *Jovian*, 1683. All which may sufficiently shew the ignorance of Mr. *Rob. Fleming* (amongst other of the like stamp,) who *never yet heard* of any such method of reasoning from the law of nature, &c. *Hered. Right from Cain to Nero*, 1717, p. 25.

(a) *Coke's Rep.* as before, fol. 3, b. See also *Moore's Report of the Postnati*, fol. 790. (b) *Coke*, *ibid.* fol. 28.

non-resistance, that it is *not confuted, but laught out of countenance* (a). Upon such and so many great authorities, we may without offence presume, that a modern prelate was mistaken, when he express'd so many terrible fears of the tendency of these principles, and ventur'd out of his element, to 'affirm of such state-maxims as these 'are, that if they must be espous'd, and are to 'be put in execution, they'll turn all the governments in the world upside (b) down': whereas, 'tis plain, those judges were convinc'd, that such maxims were the only way to set government firm upon its just bottom. But whether we are bound in charity to the dead, to conclude, that the learned Dr. Kennet was only mistaken, when he insinuated, that *this strange plea* (as he call'd that of the patriarchal monarchy,) was never 'any 'where industriously set on foot, but in *England*; 'nor—ever in *England* seriously advanced, till 'the reign of King (c) Charles II.' I shall leave to the readers reflection. Dr. Marshall's notions of *allegiance*, &c. I should not have animadverted on, if he had not trespass'd against the common rules of logick at least, if not also of law, where he said, 'What our local constitution in 'this point is, can no otherwise be known, than 'by a resort to (d) facts': for he could not but know,

(a) *Sherl. case of resist. ep. ded.* (b) Mr. Peploe's serm. at *Leverp.* 11 Jan. 1715, p. 14. (c) Kennet's 3d letter to the bishop of *Carlisle*, 1717, p. 38. (d) *Nat. Marshall's* defence of our constitution, 1717, p. 136.

## 48 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

know, that *from fact to right* is never allow'd to be a good (a) argument. As to Mr. *Whiston's* proposition, that 'the free choice, consent or recognition of a nation is the proper foundation of the rights of (b) princes'; and his affirmation, that *it appears in scripture*, 'that nothing, in ordinary cases, but the free choice or recognition of a people, gives a just right to a prince to govern (c) them'; I shall pass it over here, because the contrary thereof is demonstrated in almost every page of this book. But, since so much clamour has been rais'd against the tendency of principles manifestly founded in the laws of God and nature, as well as in the municipal law of our land, let us but take a fair view of those on the other side; and we shall find (as Dr. *Burnet* observ'd) that 'less disorder may be apprehended, from the pretensions of the *Roman* bishops, than from those maxims, that put the power of judging and controuling the magistrates in the people's hands: which opens a door to endless confusions, and indeed sets every private person upon the throne, and introduceth an anarchy, which will never admit of order or remedy; whereas those that have but one pretender over them, could more easily deal with him, and more vigorously resist (d) him'. And we are assur'd by the same unexceptionable author, that 'the resolving all power  
' in

(a) *A facto ad jus non valet argumentum.* (b) *Whist.* script. pol. p. 8. (c) *Ibid.* ep. ded. p. 3. (d) *Burnet's* vindication of church and state of Scotland 1673. p. 68, 69.

‘ in the people was first taken up by the assertors of the pope’s deposing power : for they argue’d, that if it belong’d to the people, then the pope, representing the universal church, all their rights did accrue to him ; so that, in their names, he might dispose of crowns as he (a) pleas’d’. But ’tis no wonder that doctrines of this pernicious tendency prevail, when some of the party are advanc’d to that height of blasphemy, as to affirm, that God himself did not give to the *Jews* any political laws, before *he was chosen to be their King by the express consent of the (b) people* : thus audaciously making God’s own government elective, as well as that of the King ; and both equally without foundation. Nor is it strange, that men who patronize such barefac’d insults against God himself, should dare to propagate others of the like sort against his vicegerent, to possess the unwary reader with notions utterly inconsistent with the fundamental laws of an hereditary monarchy, and to justify, (as well as they can) the worst fact that the worst of subjects were ever guilty of. Whereas the clergy of our national church, in convocation assembled, have censur’d this as a *great (c) error* : nay, and even the people’s own representatives in parliament have all along declar’d expressly against such republican doctrines ! particularly, in one of our latest instances, after an unnatural rebel-

H

lion

(a) *Burn.* serm. 30 *Jan.* 1680. (b) Rights of the church asserted, p. 151, 312. and elsewhere. (c) *Bishop Overal’s* convoc. book, lib. 1, can. 2.



## 50 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

lion and regicide, and the subsequent exclusion and abjuration of the right heir, the people in convention representatively assembled, confess'd and acknowledg'd to the world, that 'it can no way be doubted, but that his majesty's right and title to his crowns and kingdoms is, and was, every way compleated, by the death of his most royal father, without the ceremony or solemnity of a proclamation, &c. And therefore, according to their duty and allegiance, they unanimously declar'd and proclaim'd, that immediately upon the decease of—King *Charles (the first)*, the imperial crown, &c. did, by birthright, and lawful, and undoubted succession, descend and come to King *Charles (the second)*, as being lineally, justly, and lawfully next heir of the blood royal (a) &c.' — And all this, after they had kept this next heir many years in exile! and our church, in the forms of prayer compos'd and us'd on those occasions, (and which are also part of the law of the land even at this day,) does acknowledge in the presence of God himself, that the *King* was *innocent*, and a *blessed martyr*, &c. notwithstanding all the popery, and tyranny, and arbitrary power the rebels charg'd him with! that *his Son* was *his undoubted heir*, and *our then most gracious sovereign*, and that the *throne* was *his right*, even during his exile and pretended attainder! that he was not chosen, but *restor'd to his own just and undoubted rights*; and

(a) Proclam. 8 May, 1660.

## *the* REGAL SUCCESSION. 51

and as such *promiseth all loyal and dutiful allegiance to the King, and to his heirs after him* (a). Nay, and is it not manifest, that every one, who has obtain'd or attempted the possession of this crown (whether by right, as King *Edward the fourth*, or by usurpation, as *Henry* (b) *the fourth*, *Monmouth*, and others, has always made his claim to it, as the next lawful heir, and as such pretended to ascend the throne of his *ancestors*? How then is all this hypocrisy before God, and prevarication with men, to be accounted for, if after all this solemnity, the throne be denied to be hereditary? And what colour is there for any one to say, that the right of princes depends upon the choice, consent, or recognition of the people?

H 2

fo

(a) See the *forms of prayer*, &c. for 30 Jan. and 29 May.

(b) Dr. Kennet is very angry with certain authors, for calling Henry IV. an *usurper*, and imputes it to a *singular spite to him, because he was a DELIVERER!* Kenn. 3d lett. to bp. of Carl. 1716, p. 111. Such a deliverer I own (in some sense) is he who delivers me of all my money on the highway, and would kill me for endeavouring to recover it! and so would *Monmouth* have been stid'd a deliverer, if he had got the power of conferring honours and dignities on his fawning parasites! But as to the fact, we are better inform'd, that this same '*Henry IV*, tho' he was of the ' blood-royal, being first cosin unto the King, and had the crown ' resign'd unto him by *Rich. II.* and confirm'd unto him by act ' of parliament, yet, upon his death-bed, confess'd, that he had ' *no right* thereunto; as *Speed* writeth.' Bishop *Griff.* *William's rights of Kings*, fol. 21. And 'tis certain, that all our authentic laws, records and writings did, with one consent, deem him a notorious usurper, till such men arose, who would have usurpation thought to be a deliverance! from whom and which *libera nos domine!*

## 52 The SHORT HISTORY of

so directly contrary to all the authorities of scripture, history, law, and right reason!—But, to proceed.

Moses, *a* § XVIII. DURING the *Israelites* sojourning in *Egypt*, tho' they were grievously oppress'd, and made to serve with *(a)* rigour, (that is to say, depriv'd of their liberty and property, and reduc'd to a state of absolute slavery,) under *Pharaoh*, who was both arbitrary and an Idolator; and tho' they were increas'd and multiply'd, so that they were more and mightier than *(b)* the *Egyptians*; yet God (who knew best what was fit for them to do,) would not allow them to deliver themselves by a forcible resistance of their lawful sovereign, or so much as to depart out of the land, till the King gave them leave to go. In this their distress all their arms were prayers and tears. They cry'd, and their cry came up unto *(c)* God: who, in his own good time, rais'd up *(d)* Moses, to be their prince and deliverer; who, by wonderful miracles from heaven, prov'd his commission, and procur'd the King's leave for them to go. And tho' God, in his providence, had determin'd to overthrow *Pharaoh* and all his host; yet he would not suffer the *Israelites* (most of whom had been his natural-born subjects,) to lift up their hand against their King, even in their greatest distress; but took their cause into his own hand, and made them spectators only,  
not

*(a)* Exod. i. 14. *(b)*——vers. 9. *(c)*——ii. 23. *(d)*——iii.

not the instruments, of their own deliverance, and the destruction of their tyrannical (a) oppressor. And now, being miraculously brought out of *Egypt*, their government was a distinct and independent monarchy in the hands of *Moses*; who *was King in Jesurun, when the heads of the people, and the tribes of Israel were gather'd (b) together.* But so far was he from deriving his sovereignty from the choice of the people, that he had not so much as their consent, but was set over them against their will; as *St. Stephen* expressly tells us: *This, Moses, whom they refus'd, saying, who made thee a ruler and a judge? the same did God send to be a ruler, and a (c) deliverer, &c.*

§ XIX. AND that he was absolute, *Absolute and* and accountable to none for his ad- *irresistable.* ministration, but to God only, the sacred records, in many instances, do plainly prove. For, as he never ask'd the people for their advice or consent, concerning the laws which he gave them, so his divine right, and absolute authority, were remarkably asserted, by God himself, even against his own brother and sister, for but murmuring against him: *Wherefore were ye not afraid (said the Lord to Aaron and Miriam) to speak against my*

(a) *Exod. xiv. 14.* (b) *Deut. xxxiii. 5.* And yet the author of *the rights of the christ. church asserted*, p. 151, has the assurance to say, the *Jews, when they came out of the land of bondage, were under no settled government, till the Horeb-contract*, when, he pretends, they consented to take God for their King! (c) *Acts vii. 35.*



## 54 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

*my servant Moses? and the anger of the Lord was kindled against (a) them.*

But most exemplary was the punishment of (b) *Korah, Dathan and Abiram*, and their adherents, for seditiously resisting and rebelling against the same authority; ‘upon the common grounds of such things, viz. usurpation upon the people’s rights, arbitrary government, and ill management of (c) affairs’. Neither were these patriots, or assertors of the (good old) cause, of liberty, content with rebellion against *Moses*, their lawful prince, but they also presum’d to invade, usurp, and intrude upon the sacred office of *Aaron* the high-priest; who had been solemnly set apart and consecrated (d) to that high dignity, as *Moses* was promoted to the civil supremacy, by the express command of God himself, without any intervention of, or contract with, the people: as if *Moses* and *Aaron* had only exalted them-

(a) *Numb. xii. 8, 9.* (b) This *Korah* was himself a priest, and the very first of that order who presum’d to withdraw his obedience, and make a separation from his lawful high-priest or bishop. The effect of this his schism deserves the most serious consideration of all our modern separatists, who withdraw themselves from a canonical succession of undoubted lawful bishops, with whom they pretend to agree in all the fundamental points of doctrine. God give them grace to avoid the fate of *Korah*, by a timely repentance and return to unity and communion: remembering what the Apostle says, of those who forsake the true church, and break her communion, for things not demonstratively essential to salvation; viz. *If we sin wilfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin!* Heb. x. 25, 26. (c) *Stillingsf. serm. 30 Jan. 1668, p. 11.* (d) *Levit. viii.*

## the REGAL SUCCESSION 55

themselves out of pride and ambition, above others, who were equally holy, and equally worthy! *Ye take too much upon you*, (say they) *seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among (a) them; wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the (b) Lord?* whereas, 'tis allow'd, that 'whoever set up for 'being patrons of liberty, should, at the same 'time, set up for patrons of religion; for otherwise the more liberty we have, the more danger we shall be in of being (c) undone'; because, 'liberty, unless wisely used, seldom proves 'a kindness to those who have (d) it'. But when *Moses* call'd for *Dathan* and *Abiram*, they refus'd to come up; insolently charging him with arbitrary power, tyrannical administration, breach of trust and promise (e), &c. in language much unbecoming subjects to their sovereign. Which treatment of him (who was indeed not only the meekest (f) man upon the face of the earth, but also so strictly just and tender of their rights, that he had not taken one ass from them, nor hurt one of (g) them; and moreover so great a benefactor to them all, that he had rescued them from the house of bondage, by a multitude of miracles,) may well make us cease to wonder at the like unduti-

(a) Thus did our late saints cant, *God with us!* even when they rebell'd against his authority, and usurp'd the rights of our *Moses* and *Aaron*! (b) *Numb.* xvi. 3. (c) *Willis's* serm. 5 Nov. 1705, p. 15. (d) *Sherlock's* 30 Jan. 1691. p. 27. (e) *Numb.* xvi. 13, 14. (f) —xii. 3. (g) —xvi. 15.

## 56 The SHORT HISTORY of

dutifulness and ingratitude of subjects to other (and commonly even to the very best) Kings.

Upon this, *Moses*, as he was commanded by the Lord, spake unto all the congregation of the people, saying, *Depart, I pray you, from the tents of these wicked men, and touch nothing of theirs, lest ye be consumed in all their sins (a)!* For such is the heinous nature, and contagion, of those sins of rebellion and schism, that the destruction of the actors alone was not a sufficient attonement for it: but, as every one of their adherents was, in respect of *Moses*, a rebel, and in respect of *Aaron*, a schismatick, whoever joined with, or any way assisted, or countenanc'd them in their sins, was therefore liable to share the punishment. And the more effectually to deter us from the like guilt, we find, that God Almighty wrought a miracle to destroy them: for *the ground clave asunder that was under them, and the earth open'd her mouth, and swallowed them up, and their houses, and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods: they, and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit, and the earth closed upon them; and they perished from amongst the congregation. — And there came out a fire from the Lord, and consumed the 250 men, that offered (b) incense.* And for the better remembrance thereof, their censers were preserv'd, to be a memorial, that no stranger, which is not of the seed of *Aaron*, come near to offer incense before the Lord, that he be not

as

(a) Numb. xvi. 26.

(b) — 30, &c.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION. 57

as Korah and as his company——; when they strove against the Lord (a). For so they may justly be said to do, who throw off those obligations of religion and allegiance which God and nature have bound them in, and bind themselves in others of their own inventing; there being indeed no other way of rebelling against God, but by opposing his institutions. Nay, when others of the people presum'd, the next day, but to *murmur* against Moses and Aaron, for the loss of their brethren, 14700 more of them were destroy'd by a *plague* (b). By which we may perceive, how the sins of rebellion and schism are more provoking to God Almighty, and more severely punish'd by him, than even that of idolatry itself; since *there fell of the people but about 3000* (c) *men*, in that their first and greatest idolatry, when they worshipp'd their *golden calf*: and from hence we may conclude, how desperate a remedy it is, to rebel against lawful authority, for fear of idolatry. For 'tis well observ'd by the learned *Stillingfleet*, that, 'let the pretences be never so popular, the persons never so great and famous; nay, though they were of the great council of the nation, yet we see God doth not abate of his severity upon any of these (d) considerations'.

I

Thus

(a) *Numb.* xvi. 40. and xxvi. 9. (b) ——— *vers.* 49. These proofs, amongst others, may shew the falshood of the author of the *rights of the christian church asserted*, p. 312. where he says, God did not miraculously interpose, even among the Jews, till they had chosen him for their King; viz. at Horeb, where this blasphemous pretends, an ORIGINAL-CONTRACT was made between God and the people! (c) *Exod.* xxii. 28. (d) *Stillingfleet*, *serm.* 30 *Jan.* 1668, p. 34.



## 58 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

Thus was the divine authority and absolute irresistible power of *Moses* unquestionably prov'd: and, ' lest this should be thought an extraordinary case, *Moses* and *Aaron* being extraordinary persons, immediately appointed by God, and govern'd by his immediate direction, the apostle St. *Jude* alledges this example against those in his days, who were turbulent and factious, ' *who despised dominions, and spake evil of dignities, that they should perish in the gainsaying of Core.* ' (a). Which he could not have done, had not this example (as the late Dr. *Sherlock* once well observ'd) extended to all ordinary, as well as extraordinary cases; had it not been a lasting testimony of God's displeasure, against all those, ' who oppose themselves against the sovereign ' (b) powers '.

*Moses the first lawgiver.*

§ XX. AND as *Moses* was the first lawgiver, or writer, of Laws in the World, let us see how his laws (or rather those of God pronounc'd by him) agreed with the law of nature, upon this subject.

*Law of inheritance in general.*

§ XXI. IT happen'd that *Zelophebad* (one of the (c) princes of the half tribe of *Manasseh*) had no sons, but daughters: and these (grounding their plea upon the law of nature) sued unto *Moses* for their father's inheritance (for the land was divided by inheritance; Our father (said they) died in the wilderness, and he was

a) *Jude* 11. (i) *Sherl.* case of resist. p. 7. (c) His pedigree is set forth, *Numb.* xxvii. 1. and *Judg.* xvii. 3. and more largely drawn out by Mr. *Selden*, vol. 2, fol. 52, &c.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION. 59

was not in the company of them, that gather'd themselves together against the Lord, in the company of Korah, but died in his own sin, and had no sons; Why should the name of our father be done away (a)? &c. Where, by the way, we may observe, that the whole people were made sensible, by the dreadful judgment of God upon Rebels, that resisting *Moses* and *Aaron*, was a rebellion against God himself, from whom they receiv'd their authority; and that they, and every one that was in their company, had thereby forfeited God's favour, as well as the right to their inheritance. Therefore they plead, that their father was not in the company of Korah; and thereupon, *Moses* brought their cause before the (b) Lord.

§ XXII. UPON this occasion therefore (as a celebrated modern argues in another (c) case), 'we have the justest reason to expect to know the thoughts of Almighty God concerning' hereditary right. And what were they? Why, the Lord did not only adjudge that cause in favour of these daughters (which might upon occasion be a strong and incontestable authority against the *Salique* law in France,) but made it a statute of judgment (or perpetual law); saying, *If a man die, and have no son* (which, by the way, is an admission, that the son had a natural right to his father's inheritance) *then ye shall cause his inheritance to pass unto*

*According  
to proximity  
of blood.*

I 2

*his*

(a) *Numb.* xxvi. 33, 53. — xxxiv. 18. — xxvii. 3. (b)  
—vers. 5: (c) *B. Headly's* serm. at Hertford, 22 Mar. 1707.

## 60 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

*his daughter; and if he have no daughter, then—unto his brethren; and if he have no brethren, then—unto his father's brethren; and if his father have no brethren, then—unto his kinsman that is next to him of his family, and he shall possess it (a).*

*Indefeasible.*

§ XXIII. HERE we see Almighty God taking occasion (as the last quoted author expresses it) to confirm the law of nature, in respect of inheritances. And to shew us, that it is not in our power, to invert the order of nature, or (as it is in the title of the chapter) that the first born is not to be disinherited upon private affection, this other law was added by the Lord; *If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have born him children:—and if the first-born son be hers that was hated, then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born, before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-born, (or, as it is in the old margin, while the son of the hated liveth:.) but he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for (this reason, that) he is the beginning of his strength, the right of the first-born is (b) his.*

Now

(a) Numb. xxvii. 8, &c. Upon this law it was, that the great archbishop Chicheley incited Henry V. to assert a title to the crown of France: affirming, that 'if any human laws happen to cross upon this regulation, they lose the force of their obligation; in regard they go off from the standard of justice, which the sovereign legislator has given to his own people'. Collier's ecclesiastical history. vol. 1. fol. 638. (b) Deut. xxi. 15, &c.

## *the* REGAL SUCCESSION. 61

Now this law (says a learned author) ‘ was, and  
‘ still is, grounded, 1. On Gods express com-  
‘ mand, and so it is a judicial law of God: 2.  
‘ On natural reason, and so it becomes a posi-  
‘ tive law of nature, obliging all nations, at  
‘ all times, to the observation of it. — By this  
‘ law, (as my author proceeds) it is undeniably  
‘ evident, that the first-born should ever be the  
‘ heir of his father, whether the said first-born  
‘ were good or bad, beloved or hated. And the  
‘ reason, which God gives for that law is this,  
‘ *scilicet*, because the first-born *is the beginning of*  
‘ *his father’s strength*; and therefore, *the right of*  
‘ *the first-born is his (a)*; that is to say, the right  
‘ of inheritance is his. So that this law of inheri-  
‘ tance by primogeniture is not only a positive  
‘ and judicial law, made by God, binding the peo-  
‘ ple of the *Jews*: but it is also a moral law,  
‘ founded on natural reason; and therefore is for  
‘ ever obligatory, and at all times binds all na-  
‘ tions to observe and keep it. For, if, among  
‘ the *Jews*, the first-born was therefore to inhe-  
‘ rit, because he was the beginning of his fa-  
‘ ther’s strength: then, by the same force of rea-  
‘ son, ought all first-born sons, of all men what-  
‘ ever, to inherit their father’s substance, because  
‘ they all are the beginning of their father’s  
‘ strength; and therefore the right of inheritance  
‘ is theirs’ (b).

Agree-

(a) *Deut.* xxi. 17.      (b) *Jenner’s prerog. of primog.* p. 26,  
27.



## 62 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

Agreeably to which, that eminent lawyer above quoted, applies all to the kingdom of *England*; arguing from *Aristotle*, that *whatever is founded upon the law of nature, hath the same authority amongst all men*. Wherewith (he observes) our lawyers agree, for this reason, ‘for that God and  
 ‘ nature is one to all, and therefore the law of  
 ‘ God and nature is one to all (a).’ And, as ’tis plainly prov’d, that this general rule of succession was not to be defeated by any partial favour of the father or superior; so much less was it to be done by any practices of the younger brethren, children, or other inferiors. For (as a pious and learned prelate notes, upon the death of the first-born only, and not of the second or third, in *Egypt*,) ‘we may with profit well observe,  
 ‘ how the differences of children are known to  
 ‘ God—: which may yield this use, never for  
 ‘ any child to go about, with craft and subtilty,  
 ‘ or any unlawful invention of man, to thrust  
 ‘ himself into the place and prerogative thereof,  
 ‘ which God, in his providence, hath not given  
 ‘ him, but to abide in the order dispos’d to him  
 ‘ of God, and to trust in his mercy who so disposed; for fear, lest God, who knoweth our  
 ‘ order, severely punish us for breaking his order. He could have made the youngest the eldest (if he had pleas’d) &c.—Let it be thought  
 ‘ on (says he): for there is too much cause in  
 the

(a) *Coke’s Calvin’s case*, fol. 12, 13.

‘ the world given ; and sin is counted (a) wisdom’.

This law of indefeasible hereditary right, or law (*for succession*) of inheritances, Mr. *Whiston* owns to be ‘ certainly a plain and clear law, relating to the affairs of private families among the *Jews*: but how this belongs to the affairs of publick government, or succession of Kings, or princes, *he* does not (b) see’. But if he pleases to open his eyes, and observe that this law is given in general terms, and compare it with the judgment pronounc’d in the case of the daughters of *Zelophehad* (just mention’d) who was a publick person, and a prince of his tribe, he will find no just ground to distinguish in this case, between publick and private inheritances ; always remembring this maxim, that *where the law itself does not distinguish, we have no authority to make a distinction*. But in answer to this objection, and to put it out of all question, the learned divine newly quoted, argues thus ; ‘ If succession and inheritance be established upon the first-born in private families, because of his primogeniture ; then, by the same law, the right of inheritance and of succession unto the crown, is for ever settled upon the first-born of Kings : for, the first-born of Kings are the beginning of their royal fathers strength ; and therefore, the right of the first-born, that is to say, the right of inheritance and of succession to their fa-

(a) Bishop *Bakington*’s works, fol. 290. (b) Script. polit.  
p. 19, 20.

## 64 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

‘ fathers throne, is (a) theirs’. And a much greater than he, even our *Blessed Saviour* himself, in answer to *Pilate’s* question, (*Art thou a King?*) answer’d, *Thou sayest that I am a King: to this end was I (b) born, &c.* Thereby intimating, that his right to a kingdom was by birth; (according to that of the wise men, *Where is he that is born King of the (c) Jews?*) whereas he would not accept of a kingdom upon the election of the people, even when they were eager to have made him a King by (d) force.

In the case of the *stubborn and rebellious son*, tho’, upon the complaint of his parents to the magistrates, he was to be *stoned to death* by the people (e): yet we do not find, that any of them could exclude or deprive him of his birthright, or the preheminance thereof; no, not even tho’ he had been an *bater of right* and righteousness; as we shall see more at large by and by. And that this sentence extends to all such as commit the like offence against their lawful sovereign (the father of their country,) is the judgment of the church of *England*, clearly express’d in (f) convocation, as well as in her catechism, &c. But (as ’tis urg’d by an eminent Civilian, against the Jesuit *Parsons*,) ‘ What if the father be a robber? If a murther-  
‘ er? If for all excesses of villanies odious and exe-  
‘ crable both to God and man? surely, he de-  
fer-

(a) *Fenn.* prerog. of primog. p. 28. (b) *St. John* xviii. 37.  
(c) *St. Matth.* ii. 2. (d) *St. John* vi. 15. (e) *Dent.* xxi.  
18, &c. (f) *Bishop Overall’s* convoc. book, p. 25.

‘ serveth the highest degree of punishment :  
 ‘ And yet must not the son lift up his hand  
 ‘ against him ; for no offence is so great as to be  
 ‘ punish’d by parricide. But our country is  
 ‘ dearer to us than ourselves : and the prince  
 ‘ is the father of our country ; whose authority  
 ‘ is greater than of parents : and therefore he  
 ‘ must not be violated, how impious, how impe-  
 ‘ rious soever he (a) be’. For, as the son to his  
 father, (being essential relatives ; ) so also ‘ the sub-  
 ‘ ject, in point of obedience to his prince, is not  
 ‘ to dispute nor question the virtues or the vices,  
 ‘ the religion or principles of his prince ; but  
 ‘ solely to consider that essential and indissoluble  
 ‘ relation, — to wit, that he is his natural and  
 ‘ lawful prince, and therefore must of necessity  
 ‘ be (b) obeyed’.

After these, we find another law made, for  
 the better preservation of inheritances in the fa-  
 mily and name of the first-born ; that *If brethren*  
*live together, and if one of them die and have no*  
*child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without,*  
*unto a stranger : her husband’s brother (or, as it is*  
*in the margin, his next kinsman) shall go in unto*  
*her, and take her to him to wife ; — And it shall*  
*be, that the first-born which she beareth, shall suc-*  
*ceed, in the name of his brother which is dead, that*  
*his name be not put out of Israel (c) —*. Which  
 law is also explain’d by that question of the *Sad-*

K

*duces*

(a) Sir J. Hayward’s answer to *Dolem.* p. 46. where he quotes  
*Quintilian, Cicero, Baldus,* and the holy scriptures. (b) *Jen-*  
*ner of the primogen.* p. 59. (c) *Dent.* xxv. 5, 6.



## 66 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

*ducees* to our *Saviour*, in the (a) gospel; so that, it is plain, the first, second, third, and other brothers married the widow successively, one after another, according to their priority of birth, to keep up the name and honour of the first-born. Nay, and our *Saviour* himself has affirm'd the natural right of primogeniture, in his parable of the *prodigal son*: where, in the first place, he speaks generally of *a certain* (b) *man* (to shew that it was not peculiar to the *Jews*, but the common case of all men;) and then says, in the person of the father, to the eldest son, — *Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is* (c) *thine*; that is, by right of birth, as my eldest son.

After all these several express laws and testimonies of holy scripture, I must own myself absolutely at a loss, to understand what some of our modern writers (who have not openly renounc'd scripture-evidence) do mean, when they tell us, that 'the right of primogeniture, in the male 'line, is 'set up, above any other (d) right': that *hereditary* right was by *no immutable law of nature*; much less by any *express institution, or declaration of the will of* (e) *God*: that the *indefeasibility* of it is by *no means agreeable to the mind of God in the* (f) *scriptures*: that 'no man can shew any 'such open and explicit declaration to have ever 'been

(a) *St. Matth. xxii. 25. St. Mark xii. 20. St. Luke xx. 29.*  
 (b) *St. Luke xv. 11.* (c) — *vers. 31.* (d) *Hoadly's serm. at Hertf. 22 March, 1707.* (e) *Kenner's 3d letter to bishop of Carl. p. 54, &c.* (f) *Lovel's serm. 15 Nov. 1715, p. 22.*

‘ been given by (a) God ’: that *God had a mind to put a contempt upon (b) it*: in short, that this law of inheritances never appears ‘ to have been ‘ ordained by God, nor approved by him, but ‘ the (c) contrary: and that we find no such law ‘ of hereditary succession, *about the state of the ‘ civil power, among the Jews*, but many things ‘ which make greatly against (d) it’.

Now, the double portion was not the only right of the first born, as Mr. Locke (e) pretends: for, we find, (as bishop Babington has justly observ’d,) that ‘ the preheminance of the birth-right ‘ was this; *Habebant jus sacerdotii & regni in familia*. They were priests and kings in the family, ‘ after the father’s death: they had a preheminance above the rest, in the division of the father’s inheritance:—they succeeded the father ‘ in all dignity, principality, and honour: they ‘ had authority over their younger brethren, so ‘ that they rose up at their presence, and minister’d to (f) them’, &c. All which is confess’d even by Mr. Fleming, who ‘ pretends to give us ‘ a more full and exact enumeration of the advantages and prerogatives included in the patriarchal blessing of those on whom the birth-right was fully conferr’d, than has yet been ‘ done by any (g) other’.

K 2

As

(a) Fleming’s hist. of hered. right, p. 24. (b) *Ibid.* p. 28.  
 (c) Whiston’s script. polit. p. 8. (d) *Ibid.* p. 16. (e) Locke  
 of government, p. 143. (f) Babington’s works, fol. 109.  
 (g) Flem. hered. right, p. 29.

## 68 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

As to Kings, more particularly, the *Lord foreseeing*, 'that the *Jews* would in time grow weary ' of his Government, makes provision in their ' law for setting up a (a) King': where we may note, that he *prefers* kingly government before any other; because he did not make provision for aristocracy, or democracy, or any other form (which their law makes no allowance (b) for), but monarchy only. Nor did he suffer the people to meddle, or concern themselves at all in the election; but reserv'd the choice thereof wholly to himself, as his own prerogative, and commanded them to submit themselves therein only to his divine appointment: saying, *When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a King over me, like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him King over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall chuse; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set King over thee; thou mayst not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy (c) brother.* This plain text a preacher, before quoted, confidently refers to, to prove, that God 'left the people free to chuse any one ' from among themselves to be their (d) King'. From whence he draws some conclusions as precarious, as his premises are evidently false. For here they are expressly bound to set up (or recognize) him whom the Lord himself should chuse.

After

(a) *Sherl. case of resist.* p. 21. (b) *Ibid.* (c) *Dent. xvii.*  
14. (d) *J. Wright's serm. at Aylesb. 15 Mar. 1719.* p. 9.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION. 69

After which he lays down some (a) rules for their King to observe; *to the end, that he may prolong his days in his kingdom, he, and his children, in the midst of (b) Israel.* 'By which words God plainly express'd, what good will be had for a kingdom, and that an hereditary one, and for the right possessor of it and his heirs, and how advantageous the continuance thereof would be to the (c) people'. And further, (as the same author doth well) 'by the way, observe, it is not said, thou shalt set under, but over; and the people are here spoken of in the singular number, as one congregate body; so that the King — was to be to the whole imbodyed society, not an inferior minister, but a superior (d) magistrate'; manifestly contrary to that false maxim of our popular demagogues, that the King is *singulis major, universis minor!*

And, here also we may perceive an evident distinction made between chusing a King, which God reserves to himself, and setting up a King over the people when so chosen: which latter power the children of *Israel* had indeed, but not the former; it being God's sole prerogative *eligere,*

(a) Particularly against *standing armies, arbitrary taxes, &c.* as 'tis explain'd by Mr. *Blakeway*, serm. 1715, p. 8. (b) *Deut.* xvii. 20. (c) *Giffard's* serm. at *Northamp.* 2 Mar. 1680, p. 27. Where he mentions a received tradition of the *Jews*, 'that of three commands, which God gave the people of *Israel* to execute, as soon as they were well settled in the land of *Canaan*; this was the first, that they should set a King over them'. (d) *Ibid.* p. 26.



## 70 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

gere, the people's duty *recognoscere*. And this distinction is clearly expounded by the judicious *Hooker*; some of whose words may not be improper to be here inserted. 'Heaps of scriptures  
' (saith he) are selected, concerning the solemn  
' coronation or inauguration of *Saul*, *David*, *Solomon* and others, by nobles, ancients, and the  
' people of the commonwealth of *Israel*; as if  
' these solemnities were a kind of deed, whereby  
' the right of dominion is given. Which strange,  
' untrue, and unnatural conceits are set abroad  
' by seed-men of rebellion, only to animate un-  
' quiet spirits, and to feed them with possibi-  
' lities of aspiring unto the thrones, if they can  
' win the hearts of the people, whatsoever here-  
' ditary title any other before them may have.  
' I say, these unjust and insolent positions I would  
' not mention, were it not thereby to make the  
' countenance of truth more orient. For unless  
' we will openly proclaim defiance unto all law,  
' equity, and reason, we must (for there is no  
' other remedy) acknowledge, that in kingdoms  
' hereditary, birth giveth right unto sovereign  
' dominion, and the death of the predecessor  
' putteth the successor by blood in seisin; those  
' publick solemnities before mentioned, do either  
' serve for an open testification of the inheritor's  
' right, or belong to the form of inducing of  
' him into possession of that thing he hath right  
' unto. Therefore, in case it does happen, that,  
' without right of blood, a man, in such wise be  
' possessed, all these new elections, and investings  
' are

‘ are utterly void; they make him no indefeasible estate, the inheritor by blood may dispossess him as an (a) usurper’.

This *valuable authority* I quote the rather, because it is own’d to be so, by no less a man than Sir George Treby; who justly calls Mr. Hooker ‘ one of the best men, the best church-men, and the most learned of our nation in his (b) time’; and this very passage (amongst others) was openly given in evidence, by the learned (c) managers in our days, before the highest judicature then in our nation. So that this distinction being well observ’d, will help us the better to understand the scripture-pharse concerning the institution of Kings. For, tho’ we do sometimes read, that the people made such an one King, we must not apprehend, that they were the original of regal power, or that the kingdom was elective; but only that they own’d or recogniz’d, and anointed (d) him as a King of God’s making; for so were *Saul*, *David*, and *Solomon* expressly set over them. But when that immediate designation of their Kings from God himself was to cease, and the kingly government settled in the house of *Judah*, according to *Jacob*’s prophecy (e), then was the kingdom to become hereditary; as appears from the before cited (f) conclusion of those provisional precepts for the King that should be set

(a) *Hooker’s eccles. pol.* B. viii. (b) In the debate about *abdication*, 1688. (c) *Sachev. trial*, fol. 159, 160. (d) *Selden’s works*, tom. iii. col. 234, 235. (e) *Gen.* xlix, 10. (f) *Viz.* in p. 69.

set over them. Agreeable to which is that observation of the *Jews*, that ‘it was necessary to  
 ‘ anoint the first of a family that was advanced  
 ‘ to a kingdom ; but it was not necessary to anoint  
 ‘ his children that succeeded him’ (a) : that is to  
 say, unless there arose a competition for the crown  
 (as in the cases of *Solomon* and *Adonijah*, *Joash*  
 and *Atbaliab*.) For ‘the eldest son of the pre-  
 ‘ decessor was afterward the chosen of the Lord :  
 ‘ his birth-right spake the Lord’s appointment,  
 ‘ as plainly as his forefather’s unction had done,  
 ‘ and invested him with the title of the Lord’s  
 ‘ anointed ; as we may see in *Josiah* and *Heze-*  
 ‘ *kiab*, and the other Kings of (b) *Judab*’.

Thus much of the laws of God, pronounc’d,  
 and recorded by *Moses*. And we do accordingly  
 find, that in all the regular successions, as well  
 among God’s people, as among the nations, the  
 royal dignity descended by priority of birth and  
 proximity of blood, according to the law of na-  
 ture : except only in cases, where the lineal suc-  
 cession was interrupted by the express appoint-  
 ment and revelation of God himself ; for other-  
 wise it was disown’d by God as a violation of his  
 laws, and no other than a meer usurpation ; as  
 will be seen in the proper places. But I must not  
 here conceal what contempt this doctrine is treat-  
 ed with, by certain moderns ; calling it ‘ a new  
 ‘ invention of some modern (c) casuists ! a slavish  
 ‘ (d) doctrine ! contrary to (e) scripture ! absurd  
 ‘ and

(a) *Patrick* on 1 *Sam.* xvi. 12. (b) *Edw. Symmons’s* loyal  
 subject, 1642, p. 6. (c) *Lovel’s* serm. 15 Nov. 1715, p. 24.  
 (d) *Ibid.* p. 31. (e) *Ibid.* p. 26.

‘ and (a) ridiculous! magical terms and (b) distinctions! groundless and (c) chymical! a plain opposition to scripture, reason, the laws and history of our own and all other (d) nations’! &c. These, and many more such like, are words of great sound: and perhaps it might be as dangerous, for a person of ordinary abilities, to engage in close controversy, with men of such universal knowledge, as it would be to take up the champions glove at a coronation! I shall beg leave therefore only to give my reader the words of an orator of no mean note, in a sermon preach’d (not many years ago) before the university of *Cambridge*, and publish’d by authority. ‘ The chiefeſt arguments which I have hitherto met with, for excluding a popiſh ſucceſſor, on the account of his religion, are ſtolen out of *Doleman* the Jeſuit; which book was written deſignedly to hinder King *James*, a proteſtant ſucceſſor’s coming to the crown. *Fleſtere ſi nequeunt ſuperos!* And I do here publicly declare, what was always my judgment, that I do believe, no human acts or power in the world can, *de jure*, hinder the deſcent of the crown upon the next heir of the blood, which is his unalterable right by religion, law, hiſtory, and (e) reaſon’.

L

As

(a) *Lovel's* ſerm. 5 Nov. 1715, p. 27. (b) *Ibid.* p. 6.  
(c) *Blakeway's* ſerm. 1715, p. 31. (d) *Ibid.* (e) Dr. *Miles Barne's* ſerm. 9. *Septem.* 1683, p. 18. It ſeems our *bishops*, &c. were of the ſame opinion in thoſe days: but now 'tis otherwiſe.



## 74 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

As to what Mr. *Whiston* affirms of the appointment of the *seventy elders* or *magistrates*, that ‘ it was done by the free choice of the people’, (a) &c. his own book may confute him; where he acknowledges, that it was neither done by the authority of the people, nor of *Jethro*, nor of *Moses*: but ‘ when *Jethro* advised *Moses* ‘ to make judges, it was only on supposition, ‘ that God should command him (b) accordingly’. Nay, and the very texts too which himself has quoted in the margin, to make good his assertion, do, indeed, prove the quite contrary. For, as it was *Jethro*’s advice to *Moses*; *Thou shalt provide out of all the people able men — and place such over them* (c) &c. so we read, that it was not the people, but *Moses* chose — *and made them heads* &c. that the Lord commanded him to make the election, and he made it accordingly: and all that the people did, or were requir’d to do, was to *sanctify themselves* against the day that was appointed, for *Moses* to make the election, as the Lord had commanded (d) him. And what if ‘ here no right of families, or of primogeniture, ‘ can be at all (e) pretended’? Was the hereditary succession of inferior magistrates ever contended for? and these ’tis plain were no other; for the supreme power remain’d still in *Moses*;

to

(a) *Whist.* script. polit. p. 17. (b) *Ibid.* p. 2. (c) *Exod.* xviii. 21. (d) — vers. 25, 26. *Numb.* xi. 16, &c. *Deuter.* i. 13, 15. — xvi. 18. (e) *Whist.* script. polit. p. 17.

to whom the final appeal lay in all great matters (a).

§ XXIV. BUT *Moses*, being forewarn'd of his death, and in his wisdom foresee-  
Joshua.  
 ing, that these elders, or magistrates, tho' there were seventy of them, could not be able to go thorow with the great work, nor retain the people in due obedience, without the support of a supreme governor, presented this petition to the Lord, to *set a man over the congregation, which may go out before them, and which may go in before them, and which may lead them out, and which may bring them in; that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no (b) shepherd.* And thereupon the Lord appointed *Joshua* to succeed him: not by any choice or nomination of the people, but upon the immediate designation of the Lord himself, and by the mediate authority of *Moses*; whom the Lord commanded to *lay his hand upon him, and to give him a charge; and to put some of his honour upon him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel might be obedient (c).* And so far were the people then, from claiming it as their right, by any pretence of an original contract, to chuse their own rulers, or to cramp their authority with limitations, that we find them ready to *hearken unto him, and to do as the Lord commanded (d)* *Moses*. Nor did they content themselves, with promising an absolute and unconditional obedience to his *commands in all*  
L 2
things,

(a) *Exod.* xviii. 22, 26. (b) *Numb.* xxvii. 16, 17. (c) —  
 vers. 18. (d) *Deut.* xxxiv. 9.

## 76 The SHORT HISTORY of

*things, but further declar'd, that they would put to death whosoever should rebel against his commandment, and would not hearken unto his words, in all that he commanded (a). And all this was soon after ratified by the Lord himself, when he magnified Joshua in the sight of all Israel, and they feared him, as they feared Moses, all the days of his life (b).*

But there soon happen'd a remarkable incident, which well deserves a place here. After *Joshua* had taken possession of the promised land, and dismiss'd the *Reubenites*, *Gadites*, and the half tribe of *Manasseh*, to their proper inheritance on this side of *Jordan*, they, at their passage, erected an (c) altar, only as a memorial of their relation to the other tribes, and of their equal right to the worship of the Lord at *Shiloh* on the other side. But this appearance of a new altar seeming to betoken a new religion, and a separation from the tabernacle set up (d) at *Shiloh*, justly alarm'd *Joshua*, and the whole congregation; who thereupon immediately prepar'd to go up to war against the supposed schismatics. But first they prudently sent an honourable embassy, to expostulate with their brethren, concerning the sin and danger

(a) *Josh. i. 16.* Upon which a learned bishop judiciously observes, that 'this was an absolute government, and tho' martial, yet most excellent, to keep the people within the bounds of their obedience; — who, daring not to stir under rigid tyrants, do kick with their heels against the most pious princes'. Bishop *Griff. Williams's* rights of Kings, &c. fol. 18. (b) *Josh. iv. 14.* (c) — xxii. (d) — xviii. 1.

danger of separation : upon which the suspected party, knowing themselves to be subjects to *Joshua*, (whom therefore they could not lawfully resist) they first fairly set forth the justice of their cause to his ambassadors, and then made their humble appeal upon it to God. They did not undutifully resent the groundless imputation ; and fly in the face of their sovereign, to complain of the pretended breach of privilege, and to demand reparation for their injur'd honour ! much less did they presume to lift up their hands against his lawful authority, even in such a clear case of self-defence ; tho' they might have fairly made that plea, and were strong enough (by situation and otherwise) to have forcibly maintain'd it. But their hands were only lifted up to heaven, and their only arms were prayers and tears, for the proof of their innocence, and protection against hasty violence. And thus it pleas'd God, that the truth was manifested, the innocent clear'd, and their brethren satisfied, to their mutual comfort : whereas, had they been acted by modern politicks, there had probably as fatal a separation happen'd then, as did afterwards under the conduct of *Jeroboam*.

And, as the people had no authoritative hand in the advancement of *Joshua* ; so neither did they presume to set up any successor after his death ; tho' they had their *Sanbedrim* (or parliament, as some are pleas'd to call it,) then sitting : but, finding that it did not belong to them to chuse themselves a King, or supreme governor, they



## 78 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

they ask'd the Lord, saying, *Who shall go up for us against the Canaanite first, to fight against (a) them? and the Lord (b) appointed the tribe of Judah, in which the kingdom was afterwards to be establish'd. But now, when they had not, for some time, any one civil magistrate, supreme over all the tribes, every several tribe seems to be left under the particular government of its proper chief, as the hereditary princes (c) or heads of their respective tribes: for this government was originally patriarchal, and descended by primogeniture, as hath been shew'd at large. But the common principle of unity amongst all the tribes was the high-priest; who was likewise hereditary from Aaron, and was the ultimate judge of all (d) controversies, even in civil and criminal affairs, till another judge was rais'd up for that purpose by the Lord. Yea, and even then too, the authority of the high-priest was, in many respects, superior to that of the judge himself: as appears in the case of Eleazer and Joshua; where Joshua himself was commanded to go out, and to come in, according to the direction of the high-priest, after the judgment of Urim before the (e) Lord. In short, during this interval, there was one hereditary prince over every tribe, and one hereditary high-priest over them all, to determine*

(a) *Judg.* i. 1. (b) — *vers.* 2. And so he did again, on a like occasion, against Benjamin. — *xx.* 18. (c) *Numb.* i. 16, 20, &c. — *vii.* 2. — *xxxiv.* 18, 22, &c. 1 *Chron.* xxvii. 16, 21, &c. (d) *Deut.* xvii. 8, &c. (e) *Numb.* xxvii. 21.

termine differences among them, or any case too hard for the princes: but, upon emergent occasions, God, who was immediately their King, in this *theocracy* (as 'tis therefore call'd,) took care of them, and rais'd up deliverers for them; as will appear presently. If this scheme be objected to, by the popular advocates, as inconclusive, let them prove a better. Sure I am, that if they contend for a perfect parity among the several tribes, without any control, 'twill rather leave us room to conclude, from what follows, that God gave his people a taste of the miseries naturally attending such a state of anarchy (tho' they give it the name of a common-wealth!) that they might be the more desirous of, and the more sensible of their future happiness under, monarchical government, which he had, from the beginning, resolv'd to bless them with. Thus, whereas, afterwards, under their lawful monarchs, they were always superior to their enemies, till such time, as, by their repeated sins, they had provok'd God to cast them off; here we see the several tribes fighting with different fortune; some conquering, and others conquered. For, *after that the Lord had given rest unto Israel from all their enemies* (a) &c. they (through a fatal oblivion!) suffering themselves to be drawn in, first to tolerate, and then to unite and incorporate themselves with, the people of the nations, *the Lord left those who remain'd, to be snares and traps unto them,*  
and

(a) *Josh.* xxiii. 1.

## 80 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

*and scourges in their sides, and thorns in their eyes, until they perish'd from off the land (a) &c. that through them he might prove Israel, whether they would keep the way of the Lord, to walk therein, (b) &c.*

Thus we read, that no sooner were *Joshua* and the elders dead, who had seen all the great works of the Lord in former days, but the next generation forsook the Lord God of their fathers, and join'd themselves to the heathens and their idols (c): whereby having, as it were, put themselves out of the Lord's protection, he delivered them into the hands of spoilers, that spoiled them, and exposed them to the mercy of foreign tyrants! civil wars! and all the other mischiefs and disorders consequent upon irreligion and anarchy (d)! and yet they were not quite destitute of government (as before is observ'd): for zealous *Phineas* stood before the ark, as high-priest, in those days; and there were the elders of the congregation, to govern them in the (e) commonwealth. Notwithstanding which, they are said, to have 'found themselves in a state of nature (or rather unnatural confusion) where will and power were the only measure of their actions: (and all this) because they had no King, no supreme magistrate in (f) *Israel*'. They wanted a monarch still, the breath of their nostrils (g), without whom they had,

(a) *Josk.* xxiii. 13. (b) *Judg.* ii. 23. (c) — ii. 8, &c.  
 (d) — ii. 14. — iii. 8, 12. — iv. 2. — vi. 1. — x. 7, 9.  
 — xiii. 1. (e) *Judg.* xx. 28. — xxi. 16. (f) Bishop Chandler's serm. 30 Jan. 1717, p. 7. (g) *Lament.* iv. 20.

had, as it were, *neither life nor (a) soul!* For so it is, that, after the repetition of their sins and sufferings, we are usually told (as a reason thereof, that, *in those days there was no King in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes (b)!* that is to say, they all acted without any law, and did what they would without controul. This is clearly exemplified in the theft and idolatry of (c) *Micah*; the rapines and idolatry also of the (d) *Danites*; the bestialities of the men of (e) *Gibeah*; and the bloody civil wars which arose thereupon between the *Benjamites* and their (f) brethren: all which enormities the Holy Ghost imputeth to the want of a King and regal government; for, as a learned gentleman observes, ‘it seems, no government but the government of a King, in the judgment of the scriptures, could restrain men from doing what they g listed’. And yet we have heard even this very state of anarchy call’d *the felicity of those (b) times!* and the people, who liv’d under it, *as free a people as ever liv’d in the (i) world!* But ’tis the less to be wonder’d at, in such men as these, when a person of a much higher station was not asham’d to tell the world, that he *always reckon’d those eight years (of the Oliverian usurpation in Scotland) a time of*

M great

(a) *Cujus nutu, quasi anima & mente regerentur.* Luc. Flor. l. 4. c. 3. (b) *Judg.* xvii. 6. — xviii. 1. — xix. 1. — xxi. 25. (c) *Judg.* xvii. (d) — xviii. (e) — xix. (f) — xx. (g) *Filmer’s observ. on Aristot. polit. pref.* (h) *Bradbury*, 5 Nov. 1711, p. 30. (i) *J. Wright’s serm. at Ailesb.* 15 Mar. 1719. p. 8.



## 82 The SHORT HISTORY of

great peace and (a) prosperity! By this however we may see what sort of freedom and liberty such people clamour so much for: but, 'tis no argument of their being the *Lord's* prophets who cry *peace, peace, when there is no* (b) *peace*; but rather the contrary: since one, who was undoubtedly inspired, speaks of such a state, as an heavy judgment; saying, in the person of the *Israelites*, — *We have no King, because we feared not the* (c) *Lord*.

*Judges.* § XXV. Nevertheless, amidst all their oppressions, no sooner did they become sensible of their apostacy, and turn unto the Lord, but *he raised up judges, which delivered them out of the hand of those that spoiled* (d) *them*.

*Othniel.* Thus *Othniel* was rais'd up, by the Lord, to deliver them out of the hand of a foreign (e) tyrant, who had been permitted to enslave them *eight* years.

After his death, being again without a governor, their relapse into sin provok'd the Lord, to suffer another foreign tyrant, to enslave them *eighteen* years: but, upon their repentance, *Ehud.* the Lord rais'd up *Ehud*, who kill'd the tyrant in cold (f) blood. Which act (however extraordinary it may seem) is justified by all writers: not only, because *Ehud* had that express appointment and commission from the Lord, to deliver his people, but because *Eglon* was a foreigner

(a) *Burner's history of his own Times*, fol. 61. (b) *Jerem.* vi. 14. — viii. 11. (c) *Ilos.* x. 3. (d) *Judg.* ii. 16. (e) — iii. 8, 9. (f) *Judg.* iii. 12, &c.

reigner and alien, and had no right to the dominion over them, except (what is often misinterpreted or mistaken for providence) the bare permission of God; such as even the devil himself has often had! for the devil had full as good a commission for his power over holy (a) *Job*, and others. But this act of *Ebud's*, however justifiable, for the reasons before given, can be no warrant for others to do any violence to their lawful sovereigns: because 'this is certain, that the 'higher powers which are ordained of God (and as 'such to be obey'd,) are only the lawful powers, 'not to be apply'd to (b) usurpers'.

After him (c) *Shamgar*. But it was not long before the people, by fresh sins, provok'd the Lord to leave them under the tyranny of another foreigner *twenty* years: till, upon their repentance, he was pleas'd to raise up (d) *Deborah*, and to deliver the oppressor into the hand of a woman, who smote him to death (e), where he thought to have slept in security. And for this act she is pronounc'd *blest above women* (f), tho' 'tis plain, she had no express commission for it, nor any quarrel against him or his master *Jabin*, but that of his being a tyrant without title; for *there was peace between him, and the house of her husband* (g).

Then *Israel* return'd to their sins, and were therefore given up to other foreigners, who tyranniz'd

M 2

ranniz'd

(a) *Job*. i. 12. — ii. 6. (b) *Burn. serm.* 5 Nov. 1710, p. 10.

(c) *Judg.* iii. 31. (d) — iv. 4. (e) — vers. 21.

(f) — v. 24. (g) — iv. 17.

# 84 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

ranniz'd over them seven years (a), till Gideon. *Gideon* was rais'd up by the Lord, to deliver them. And yet, tho' they cry'd unto the (b) Lord against their oppressors, they were so far from being ready as they ought) to assist towards their own deliverance, that they would have put *Gideon* to death, because he had cast down the altar of Baal, and cut down the grove that was by it (c). And so they were equally stupid afterwards, in the case of *Sampson*; as shall be shewn in its proper place. However, after *Gideon* had deliver'd them from their enemies, and put several of those foreign tyrants to death, the *Israelites* offer'd to him, and his heirs, an act of settlement (d) of the sovereignty over them; saying, Rule thou over us, both thou, and thy son, and thy son's son (e) also: But he utterly refus'd to accept thereof: not as Mr *Whiston* supposes) 'as being inconsistent with the present (f) theocracy'; for he was sensible, that kingly government had been promis'd the *Israelites*, as one of their greatest blessings, and provided for them by God himself, against such time as they should be settled in the promised land (g); but because he had no warrant for it in the law, nor any particular revelation from the Lord; without one of which, he knew, the peoples election or consent could give him no right or title. He might, 'tis true, have

(a) *Judg.* vi. 11. (b) — ver. 6. (c) — ver. 30.  
 (d) *Morer's* serm. 29 May, 1699, p. 15. (e) *Judg.* viii. 22.  
 (f) *Script. polit.* p. 23. (g) *Gen.* xvii. 6, 16. — xlix. 10.  
*Deut.* xlii. 14.

have pleaded providence, and the people's submission (as others have done since): but he was too good a man, so to belie God's providence; being sensible, that such foundations, alone, are too sandy to build a lawful government upon, without either a legal title, or else an express and manifest revelation from heaven in his favour; according to Mr. *Whiston's* own confession above taken notice of (a).

Nevertheless, after his death, *Abimelech* (his bastard son) taking occasion from that offer of the people to his father, by means of divers popular arguments drawn from that stale pretence of the publick good, usurped the government as King: where the very argument which he made use of to influence them, shews plainly that monarchy was generally esteem'd more beneficial to the people, than either democracy or aristocracy; *Whether is better for you* (says he,) *either that all the sons of Jerubbaal (which are threescore and ten persons) reign over you, or that one reign over* (b) *you?* And this inclin'd their hearts to follow him: so that, having been furnish'd with money underhand, he therewith hired vain and light persons (or, as they are call'd in the margin of the old translation, *idle fellows and vagabonds*) which followed him (c); by the help of which mercenary wretches, (the most usual followers of such a mock-prince!) he strengthen'd himself, so as to be able to suppress an insurrection made against him

(a) Page 7. (b) *Judg.* ix. 2, 3. (c) — *vers.* 4.



## 86 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

him (a). And having put to death all the other pretenders (whose prior rights, by birth, he was jealous of) except one who had happily escap'd (b), the usurper vainly fancy'd himself to be thoroughly settled, and thereby to have acquir'd a right to the crown, 'ruling all things according to his lust, and (as is usual with such as come unjustly by the power) neglecting the ordinances and prescript of the law, and hating all those that in any sort were maintainers of (c) equity'. But when all human means seem'd to fail, the Lord (who 'will never want means and methods to make those who forget him re- turn to themselves and to remember (d) him') had instruments, unthought of, to execute his divine vengeance against him, and his followers; first sending an evil (e) spirit (that is, the spirit of discord, or the devil, whom he permitted to go as his instrument of vengeance) between him, and those who had assisted him in his usurpation, and, at last, beating out his brains, by the hands of a weak woman, after he had acted the King *three years* (f). Thus (as one of our commentators observes) 'we see, that the union among wicked men, founded in sin, continueth not, but soon breaketh out, through God's just judgment, into most deadly enmity: and again, that the most wicked may prevail in their wars for a time, as

(a) *Judg.* ix. 34, &c. (b) — *vers.* 5, &c. (c) *Joseph*, lib. v. cap. 9. (d) *Burn.* *serm.* 23 *Decem.* 1688, p. 32. (e) *Judg.* ix. 23. (f) — *vers.* 22, and 53.

‘ as did *Abimelech*, for the punishment of other  
 ‘ wicked; themselves receiving their just reward  
 ‘ e’er long, as he also (*a*) did’. And ’tis a just  
 remark of a learned divine, that ‘ wheresoever  
 ‘ the scriptures mention the constitution of a  
 ‘ King after this manner, — they likewise re-  
 ‘ cord not only the frustrations of the people’s  
 ‘ endeavours, but also that they were frustrated  
 ‘ by some heavy and sudden judgments from God,  
 ‘ both upon the usurper (whereby he was de-  
 ‘ graded from his undue honour,) and the people  
 ‘ who presumed to confer that honour upon him  
 ‘ without a warrant from God, and so, by that  
 ‘ means, to obtrude a deputy upon God, of their  
 ‘ own, and not of God’s (*b*) election’. Which  
 is enough to expose the unwarrantableness of  
 such men’s reasonings, as ‘ suppose it more than  
 ‘ possible, that a people may bind themselves,  
 ‘ and convey the sovereignty over them, to a per-  
 ‘ son or family, expressly and by name: which  
 ‘ bond or conveyance ratified by publick faith,  
 ‘ contract and agreement, they look upon to be  
 ‘ forthwith sacred and inviolable, and a title not  
 ‘ inferior to an immediate nomination from (*c*)  
 ‘ heaven’ &c.

But Mr. *Whiston*, after this manner, would  
 insinuate, from *Abimelech*’s courting the people to  
 elect him, that ‘ that method of free election,  
 ‘ was the then solemn known way of obtaining  
 ‘ secular

(*a*) Dr. Mayer. (*b*) *Hudson* of gover. p. 114. (*c*) *Garmst.*  
 serm. 7 June, 1716, p. 6.

## 88 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

‘secular dominion in the world’ (a): but he does not observe, that, in the very offer, which the same people had newly before made to *Gideon*, they expressly acknowledge the natural right of hereditary succession; saying, *rule thou over us, both thou, and thy son, and thy son’s son*. Where they plainly intimate, that if the father were once lawfully their King, the sons, and other descendants, would expect to succeed of course, without any other title, than that of their birth: for it was the father only, to whom they were personally oblig’d, for their deliverance from the hand of *Midian*. Neither is it strange, that one who had no other means of gratifying his unjust ambition, than by cajoling the mutinous populace, should encourage them to believe and assert more power than they truly had, when he knew, that whatever extraordinary use they should make thereof, it would the better answer his own end: as if he had said to them, *I, and my followers, will invest you, in your Sanhedrim, with the pretended power to make a King, that I myself may be the man!* However, were it as he supposes, I wonder what use our author could make of it, or how he can be consistent with himself, when, at the same time, he tells us, ‘that yet, the exercise of this  
‘power by the people, when done upon foolish  
‘motives, contrary to other obligations, and  
‘accompanied with blood and violence, may be  
‘highly criminal before *God*, and bring down  
‘severe

(a) *Whist. Script. polit.* p. 23.

*the* REGAL SUCCESSION. 89

‘ severe judgments from (a) him ’! But I shall not insist upon his inconsistencies. ’Tis enough for me that our popular advocates can have little reason to triumph in this case: since, whatever power the people presum’d to take to themselves, in order to the setting up of *Abimelech*, ’tis plain, it turned both to his ruin and their destruction; and (I have the authority of a convocation to say,) that ‘ if any man shall affirm — that the ‘ fact of the *Sichemites* may lawfully be imitated ‘ by any christian people, &c. he doth greatly ‘ (b) err’.

Here I cannot omit the parable of *Jotham*, whereby he endeavoured to open the eyes of the deluded people, and to alienate their affections from the usurper; letting them know, ‘ that those ‘ who were virtuous, and whom reason and religion had taught the safe and happy estate of ‘ moderate subjection, had refused to receive, as ‘ unlawful, what others had no power to give, ‘ without direction from the King of Kings; who ‘ from the beginning (as to his own peculiar people) had appointed them, by whom and how ‘ to be govern’d. This he taught them by the ‘ *olive*, which contented it self with its fatness, ‘ the *fig-tree* with its sweetness, and the *vine* with ‘ the good juice it had: the *bramble* only, who ‘ was most base, cut down all the rest, and accepted the sovereignty. He also foretold them, ‘ by a prophetick spirit, what should befall them

N

in

(a) *Whist. script. pol.* p. 23, 24. (b) *Bp. Overal's convoc. book,* lib. i. cap. 13.



90 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

‘ in the end, and how a fire should come out of  
 ‘ the *bramble*, and consume the *cedars of Leba-*  
 ‘ *non*’ (a); signifying, that not only the common  
 people should be destroy’d by that upstart, but  
 the nobles also who had a hand in raising him to  
 his unjust power. But these being truths too  
 plain to be told in such times, no sooner had  
*Jotham* ended his *parable*, but he *ran away*, and  
*fled for fear of* (b) *Abimelech*.

After several other vicissitudes of *sinning* and  
*deliverance* (c), and *sinning* again, it pleas’d the  
 Lord at length to deliver his people *into the band*  
*of the Philistines* *forty* (d) *years*. But, the Lord  
*Sampson*. having foretold, that *Sampson* was to *be-*  
*gin to deliver* *Israel* *out of their* (e) *band*,  
 and he beginning to act accordingly, tho’ it was  
 their duty, as well as interest, to embrace all  
 occasions, and use all lawful means, to free them-  
 selves from the foreign yoke, under which they  
 groan’d: yet they basely resolv’d, and chose to  
*bind* and betray their brother into the hands of  
 his and their mortal enemies, the *Philistines*, who  
 oppress’d them, rather than contribute to their  
 own deliverance, by embracing the opportunity  
 and means that God had put into their hands!  
 And all this too, upon a most false, as well as  
 slavish principle: *Knowest thou not* (say they)  
*that the Philistines are rulers over us? What is this*  
*that*

a) *Judg.* 7 and *Sir Walt. Raleigh*, fol. 366. (b) *Judg.* ix. 21.  
 (c) *Viz.* by *Tola*, *Jair*, *Jephthah*, *Ibzan*, *Elon*, *Abdon*; of whom  
 mention is made in *Judges* x, xi and xii. (d) *Judg.* xiii. 1.  
 (e) — verf. 5.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION. 91

*that thou hast done unto us (a)?* As if the bare possession of the power could have given the *Philistines* a right to the dominion over them! Whereas, they could not but know, that, by their law, no foreign power could have any right thereto: and therefore that the bare possession of such power, without a particular revelation from God, clearly prov'd in its favour, could be nothing but a downright usurpation; and consequently was of no manner of obligation upon their consciences, but to be remov'd, as soon as they possibly could do it.

'Tis true, some may say, that the success which the *Philistines* had had against *Israel* was 'an evidence of God's giving them a right of dominion, and an earnest of God's good will to them! That God's hand, and visible marks of his providence were in it! That it was the 'Lord's doing!' &c. For thus, when our *Israel* was under the dominion of modern *Philistines*, and our rightful and lawful King driven by unnatural rebels and regicides, to seek his bread in exile, and even there too *hunted like a partridge in the mountains (b)*; when *our inheritance was turn'd to strangers, our houses to aliens! our necks were under persecution! servants ruled over us, and there was none (in human view) to deliver us out of their hands! (c) &c.* Then (I say) did those false prophets, most audaciously blaspheme the

N 2

Lord

(a) *Judg.* xv. 11.  
*merc.* v. —

(b) *1 Sam.* xxvi. 20.

(c) *La*

## 92 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

Lord of Hosts; stiling their successes against his anointed. — ‘The glorious accomplishment of  
 ‘ their prayers! — God’s sentence after solemn  
 ‘ (a) appeals! — The salvation of God! —  
 ‘ The deliverance of our laws, and liberties, and  
 ‘ birth-rights! — (and, in short) the greatest  
 ‘ demonstration of grace, that ever heaven made,  
 ‘ to any of the sons or daughters of men, next  
 ‘ to the redemption of lost man through *Christ*!’  
 (b) To such an high degree of blasphemy do men  
 gradually arise, when once they prostitute their  
 pens for gain, and let out their tongues for hire (c)!  
 But alas! ‘whither will men wander, when they  
 ‘ seek to defend what themselves know to be wick-  
 ‘ ed! when they give themselves up to the drud-  
 ‘ gery of writing for a party, which they must  
 ‘ sup-

(a) What presumptuous application has been made of such appeals, we may learn (amongst others) from a late reverend divine, who informs us, that the preachers under the command of the rebel *Monmouth*, had the impudence to *appeal to heaven for the justice of their arms, and to challenge God to decide for them in the day of battle.* *Cha. Hutton’s* serm. 26 July, 1685, p. 2. And his censure of them for it is very just; *viz.* ‘They invaded our  
 ‘ land, and made war upon their lawful prince, and so were re-  
 ‘ bels; they traduc’d his royal person and government, and so  
 ‘ were slanderers; they deceiv’d the people with innumerable  
 ‘ false stories and legendary tales, and so were liars; they robb’d  
 ‘ and plunder’d their fellow subjects of their proper goods, and so  
 ‘ were thieves; and lastly they imbrued their hands in their bre-  
 ‘ threns blood, and so were murderers’. *Exc. ibid.* p. 13. (b) *Speed’s* thanksg. serm. at *Bristol*, 24 Oct. 1651, (for the defeat of the King at *Worcester*) p. 1. (c) *Mic. iii. 11.* Bishop *Burnet* truly says, that *prayers* (or thanksgivings) *are an impious profanation of the name of God, if that for which we* (pray or) *bl:ss God be unlawful.* Sermon at *Salisbury*. 5 Nov. 1710, p. 12.

‘ support right or wrong! when they have no  
‘ principles left, but to serve present turns’! Then  
with a most wicked design to make rebellion  
seem meritorious, were good names put upon  
the most damnable actions: as resistance of law-  
ful authority was the distinguishing note of elec-  
tion, whilst obedience for conscience sake was a  
certain mark of reprobation! to be peaceable  
and loyal was an unpardonable crime, whilst to  
be seditious and rebellious was a cardinal virtue!  
to fight against the King was fighting the Lord’s  
battles! murdering bishops was the destruction  
of *anticbrist*! pulling down churches was refor-  
mation from popery! plundering the royalists  
was spoiling the *Egyptians*! sequestering men’s  
estates was doing themselves justice, (they being  
the saints, and the earth was theirs, with the ful-  
ness thereof!) and *binding their King in chains, and  
their nobles in links of iron was helping the Lord  
against the mighty* &c. ‘ For by this time the flat-  
‘ terers of that great tyrant had learned, by a  
‘ new device, upon the bare account of provi-  
‘ dence, without respect to the justice of the title  
‘ (the only right and proper foundation,) to in-  
‘ terpret and apply to his advantage whatsoever  
‘ they found, either in the scriptures or in other  
‘ writings, deliver’d concerning the power of  
‘ princes or the duty of subjects; profanely and  
‘ sacrilegiously taking the name of that holy  
‘ providence of God in vain, and using it only  
‘ as a stalking-horse, to serve the lusts and inte-  
‘ rests



# 94 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

‘ rests of ambitious (a) men’. So that it was no improper allusion of a late witty author, who compares those preachers to *poppets*, who ‘ signified nothing of themselves, but as they were ‘ guided by the masters of the machine, from ‘ under the stage, or behind the (b) hanging’! And if Mr. *Bradbury* had made an application to such preachers (of his own stamp,) and to such times as these here before us, he might with some propriety, have harangu’d against a *standing army*, and a *fawning (c) clergy*! for never could that epithet be more suitably apply’d, than to such a pack of men; whose scandalous perversions of holy scripture I should not have taken this notice of here, had we not seen the like adopted and propagated, by some who would be thought *golden (d) candlesticks* in the *church of Christ*! which brings to my mind a just reflection of a noble author, that ‘ if the person and the place ‘ can improve and aggravate the offence, (as ‘ without doubt it doth both before God and man,) ‘ methinks the preaching treason and rebellion ‘ out of the pulpits, should be worse than the advancing it in the market; as much as poisoning ‘ a man at the communion, would be worse than ‘ murdering him at a tavern. And, it may be, ‘ in

(a) *Sanders*. pref. to *Usher*, p. 5, 6. (b) *L’Estrange’s* season. memor. 1680, p. 11. (c) *Bradb.* ferm. 5 Nov. 1711, p. 23. (d) Dr. *Innes* observes, what a misfortune it is, that the *unguarded indulgence of the church* (too prodigal of her favours) induces her sometimes to confer eminent and sacred characters undeservedly upon men! Sermon. 2 June, 1717, p. 13.

‘ in that catalogue of sins, which the zeal of some  
‘ men hath thought to be the sin against the Ho-  
‘ ly Ghost, there may not any one be more rea-  
‘ sonably thought to be such, than a minister of  
‘ Christ turning rebel against his prince, (which  
‘ is a most notorious apostacy against his order)  
‘ and his preaching rebellion to the people as the  
‘ doctrine of Christ; which adding blasphemy  
‘ and pertinacy to his apostacy, hath all the marks  
‘ by which good men are taught to avoid that  
‘ sin against the Holy (a) Ghost’!

And here, by the way, it may be proper to  
shew the notorious fallacy of judging of any cause  
from its success. For, as misfortune is no cer-  
tain proof of a bad cause; so neither is success  
a proof of a good one. ‘ For those who have  
‘ a very just cause may deserve to be punish’d; and  
‘ then God may justly punish them, and deliver  
‘ them into the hands of their enemies. God  
‘ does not always determine what is right and  
‘ wrong by the events of war: for he is the sove-  
‘ reign judge of the world, and may punish a  
‘ wicked nation by unjust oppressors; as he often  
‘ did the (a) *Israelites*’. And, even in this very  
book of *Judges*, we find a remarkable instance  
to the purpose, in the two defeats which the chil-  
dren of *Benjamin* gave the rest of the tribes of  
*Israel*; where the just cause suffer’d the loss of  
*forty thousand Israelites*, and was not attended with  
success

(a) *Clarend. hist.* vol. ii. fol. 17, 18, 19. (b) *Sherl. serm.*  
27 June, 1691, p. 25.

## 96 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

success till the third (a) attack. And indeed, the whole book of *Judges* is nothing else but a series of histories to this purpose, to shew us, that conquest, and possession, and success alone, never gave any of the foreign princes a right to the dominion over *Israel*: but that still, in due time, God himself provided deliverers, to destroy the usurpers (whom he had permitted for a while, to tyrannize over his people, for their sins,) and to restore them to their just rights upon their repentance. And is not here a plain distinction, between the providence of God and his permission, that whereas, in judgment he permitted their neighbours to spoil them, in his Mercy he provided deliverers, to rescue them out of their hands?

'Tis true, among these judges, there was no such thing as any hereditary descent or succession, by birth-right: nor was it necessary, since God, who was himself their King, rais'd up whom he thought fit, as vice-roys, magistrates, and officers under him, upon extraordinary occasions; letting them, between whiles, feel the miseries of an *Inter-regnum*, which never happens in hereditary governments. And it is further remarkable, that as God always punish'd their sins by foreign (b) instruments, so, whenever he was pleas'd to deliver them, it was still by the means of some  
one

(a) *Judg.* xx. 18, &c. (b) On this account I suppose it was, that bishop *Burnet* reckon'd among the singular blessings of God upon this nation, 'the preserving us, during our civil wars, 'from being made a prey to our neighbours, and from strangers 'getting footing among us'. *Burn.* serm. 5 Nov. 1689, p. 4.

one of their own countrymen, unexpectedly rais'd up: and, as he permitted six several tyrants to oppress them, so (to shew how much he delights in mercy more than judgment) he provided twice as many (*a*) judges, in their distress, to deliver them. But nevertheless, those frequent instances of his uncovenanted mercy ought not to make us presume upon the like extraordinary deliverances, whenever we rashly and rebelliously plunge ourselves into difficulties and dangers.

§ XXVI. HITHERTO the government of *Israel* had been a *Theocracy*: that is, <sup>Kings of all nations.</sup> God himself was their King after a peculiar manner, and ruled them by viceroys of his own more immediate nomination, and according to laws of his own making; the last appeal or *dernier resort* being always, in extraordinary cases, to himself, by means of the miraculous *Urim* and *Tbummim*. But now the people, desiring a King by succession, rather than by deputation, we shall find them govern'd after another (*b*) manner: namely, by a  
O race

(*a*) Viz. Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Deborah, Gideon, Tola, Jair, Jephthah, Ibzan, Elam, Abdon, and Sampson. (*b*) The difference between the Kings and Judges is well describ'd by *Mart. Becanus* the Jesuit, in these three circumstances: 1. The judges were rais'd up by God, in an extraordinary manner, to deliver his people in times of distress: but the Kings (that is, of Judah, downwards from Solomon) reign'd by right of succession; and govern'd as well in times of peace as of war. 2. The judges did not succeed one another immediately, but after some interval of time, as the people's necessities requir'd, and their repentance procur'd them, a deliverance: but when one King died, another succeeded immediately. 3. The



## 98 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

race of hereditary monarchs, succeeding one another, according to the natural law of primogeniture; except in two or three of the first instances, before the government was thoroughly settled; as I shall shew in due order.

For, after the death of *Eli* the high-priest, *Samuel* the prophet judged Israel *all the days of his* (a) *life*: but, when he was old, *he made his sons judges*; who *walked not in his ways, but turned aside after lucre, and took bribes, and perverted judgment* (b). Under pretence of which grievances and mal-administration (for ‘when men’s discontents grow ripe, there seldom wants a plausible occasion to vent (c) them’) the people, who are too naturally prone to revolutions, and changes of government, grew weary of judges, and long’d for the completion of God’s promise; desiring a *King to judge them like all the* (d) *nations*: By which last words, we may perceive, that in those days all the nations were govern’d by Kings; whereas

3. *The judges themselves were not so properly the rulers of the people, as God himself who rais’d them up: but the Kings were rulers in their own right, as well as by God’s authority.* Becani analog. vet. & novi testam. c. xvi. q. 1. To which I may add another, from the learned bishop *Morton*, that, in the time of the Kings, ‘neither did the judicial laws retain their full force, neither did God himself appoint captains over the armies, (as in the time of the judges) but all was done according to the will and commandment of the Kings; who, although they did keep the judicial law in part, and for the great extremities in war, ask’d counsel of God, yet they were free in both these respects’ *Morton’s Solomon, or kingdom of Israel*, 1596, p. 14, in 4to.

(a) 1 Sam. vii 15. (b) — viii. 1, &c. (c) *Stillingsf.* ferm. 13 Nov. 1678, p. 7. (d) 1 Sam. viii. 5.

whereas commonwealths were never once heard of, either in the laws of God or nature, but began (a) by rebellion and usurpation. For, (as Dr. *Sherlock* truly observ'd,) ' *Aristocracies* and *Democracies* were a defection from regal power, occasion'd by the ill government of princes, or by the giddiness and licentious humour of the people, who are fond of liberty, power, and innovations: but, tho' God by his providence permitted such changes of government, he never by a visible authority and direction form'd and modell'd a commonwealth as he did the *Jewish* (b) monarchy'. And Mr. *Selden* proves, that although divers of the chiefest states of the old *Grecians* (and I think only of the *Grecians* in the elder ages) were in their most flourishing times *Democracies* or *Optimacies*: yet the more ancient states there were, in every place, (c) ' *monarchies*'. Yea, and bishop *Lloyd* himself admits, there was no such government as a free-state or commonwealth known in the world, in *David's* (d) time. All which would incline us to conclude, with another learned author, that whensoever the first was erected, it had *neither other foundation, than rebellion, murder and usurpation, nor other author than the* (e) *devil*! And further too we may learn, that when the people ask'd a King, as other nations had, they ' meant thereby

O 2

' prin-

(a) *Viz.* among the *Grecians*. (b) *Sherl. serm.* 29 May, 1685, p. 9, 10. (c) *Seld. (Tit. of hon.) vol. iii. col. 118.* (d) *Disc. of God's ways of dispos. of kings, 1691, p. 16.* (e) *Hudson of governm. 1647, p. 90.*

‘ principally, that such their Kings might by  
 ‘ succession govern them, so as one being dead,  
 ‘ they might still have (a) another’.

*Hereditary.* § XXVII. FOR that those Kings of the nations were all hereditary too, not elective, we might reasonably conclude, (if we had no better proof) since we find, that the *Israelites* were not then grown presumptuous enough, to undertake such a revolution on their own heads, and to proceed to an election of a King by their own authority (in which, doubtless, they would have been as forward to imitate the *nations*, if it had been their practice, as in the having of one) tho’ *all the elders of Israel had gather’d themselves together* in convention (b). But they, dreaming of no such power, much less attempting to usurp it, applied themselves to (c) *Samuel*, that by his authority, or interest (whom they knew to be a prophet of the Lord, as well as their judge) they might have a King set over them; saying to him, *now make us a King to judge us, &c.* Yet neither would he take upon himself to do it, but was *displeas’d*, and *prayed unto the Lord* for his (d) direction.

Here it seems most proper to obviate that common objection which is made by certain republicans, against kingly government. *Samuel* himself alone was not *displeas’d* with their desire to alter his government, but he tells ’em also, that their *wickedness was great in the sight of the Lord*,

(a) Bp. *Overal*’s convoc. book, l. i. c. 14. (b) 1 *Sam.* viii. 4.  
 (c) — verf. 5. (d) — verf. 5.

*Lord, in asking a King*: and the people themselves acknowledge, that they *had added unto all their sins this evil, to ask them a (a) King*. But good interpreters agree, that their *sin* was not in their *asking a King* (for that I have shewn *(b)* to have been agreeable to the revealed will of God,) but in the circumstances and manner of their doing it. *Viz.* In their not *asking* for such a *King* as should *fear the Lord*, and govern them in equity, according to the law of *(c)* God; but out of a preposterous desire, only that they might be like unto other *nations*: in their inordinate asking a King, without first asking God's advice about it, in the allow'd method of the *Urim* and the *(d) Thummim*: doing it out of a discontent with their present happy condition, and an inconstant humour of change: out of an ungrateful and rebellious disposition against *Samuel*, who had done such great things for them, and never injur'd *(e)* them: out of a distrust of God, and a base fear *(f)* of their enemies, from whom they had been often deliver'd: proceeding in the tract of their former rebellious *(g)* practices, so highly displeasing to God: out of a foolish affection to be *like all the (h) nations*, without considering whether it was good or bad: under a specious pretext *(i)* of mal-administration; of which they were not competent judges: without waiting God's time to give them a King, or expect-

(a) 1 Sam. xii. 19. (b) P. 40, 68, and 69. (c) Deut. xvii. 19. (d) Exod. xxviii. 30. (e) 1 Sam. xii. 3, &c. (f) — vers. 12. (g) — viii. 8. (h) — vers. 5, &c. (i) Ibid.



# 102 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

expecting the death of *Samuel*, whom he had set over them ; but *rejecting* (a) the one, and thereby in consequence (as much as in them lay) deposing the other, through a disaffection to that government which himself had appointed them, and a weariness of his immediate election and designation of their governours : and audaciously persisting in their mutinous demand, even after it appear'd *displeasing* to (b) *Samuel* ; on which accounts God look'd on it as a *rejecting* of him more than *Samuel*, since he had appointed him. However he commanded him to *hearken unto* (c) *them* in all that they said ; but withal to *shew them the manner* (or right) of (d) *Kings* ; that they might not afterwards have any pretence to complain of their prerogatives and absolute power, or think to cast them off again at their pleasure. Where likewise we may observe, how absolute all the *Kings of the nations* originally were ; among whom there were *no laws, but the King's will and* (e) *pleasure*.

## § XXVIII.

(a) 1 Sam. xii. vers. 7. (b) — vers. 19. (c) — vers. 7. (d) — viii. 9. (e) *Populus nullis legibus tenebatur, sed arbitria regum pro legibus erant*. Justin. hist. p. 1. Mr. Selden rejects this testimony as *ridiculous* ; and takes notice of an observation, that *Homer*, writing of the heroick times, hath not the word νόμος, i. e. a prescribed law, but only δέσμις, i. e. an arbitrary rule : this, he says, is false ; for proof of which he cites, εὐνομίην and νόμος αἰδώς in *Homer* ; and tells us of *Talus*, his laws in *Crete* written in brass, before *Homer's* time, &c. Selden tom. 3. col. 935. But that learned gentleman is severely animadverted on for it, by another ; who observes, that by νόμος αἰδώς *Homer* means the just measure of riming, but never useth νόμος for

PH

MUSEUM  
BRITANNICUM

§ XXVIII. WHAT this manner (or *Absolute.* right) of the King was, we have express'd by Samuel, thus, *He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself for his chariots, and to be his horsemen, and some shall run before his chariots; and he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties, and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots: and he will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers: and he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your olive-yards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants: and he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants: and he will take your men-servants, and your maid-servants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work: he will take the tenth of your sheep; and ye shall be his servants (a).* Where I must observe, by the way,

for the *set law of living*: and besides, that there were many ages, and many Kings, before *Homer's* time, and before *Talus*, *Minos*, *Radamanthus*, or any other law-maker; yea, even before *Moses* himself, who was the first that either gave laws or invented letters. \* And therefore (*says he*) *Mr. Selden, vi veritatis victus*, \* confesseth (*ibid.*) that, in the first times, in the beginning of states, \* there were no laws, but the arbitrements of princes, as *Pomponius* speaketh. *Bishop Griff. Williams's rights of Kings*, 1662, fol. 78, 79. which agrees with the authorities herein before cited (p. 43.) from *Coke's reports*; as well as with the opinion of the judges, in the great *case del union*, reported by *Sr. Fran. Moore*, fol. 790, no one opinion in all our law-books contradicting it; as before is observ'd, p. 46.

(a) 1 Sam. viii. 11, &c.

way, that the word *servants* is to be understood,  
 ‘ not as servants signifies slaves and vassals, but  
 ‘ subjects, who owe all duty and service to their  
 ‘ prince as far as he needs (a) them : according to  
 that of our blessed Saviour himself, where he  
 says, *if my kingdom were of this world, then would*  
*my servants (b) fight.* But, since it is made a great  
 question among the learned, whether this speech  
 of *Samuel’s* shews what the King had a just right  
 to do, or only what, by a stretch of his power,  
 he would do ; whether it describes ‘ some of the  
 ‘ many fore calamities which are too probable  
 ‘ consequences upon the establishment of absolute  
 ‘ monarchy in any nation, and which may all be  
 ‘ summ’d up in one comprehensive word (c)  
 ‘ *slavery*’; or whether all these were not intole-  
 ‘ rable, but such as have been born, and are so  
 ‘ still, by free consent of the subjects towards  
 ‘ their princes, and what subjects ought with pa-  
 ‘ tience to bear at their soveraign’s (d) hand’, I  
 shall beg leave to lay before the reader these fol-  
 lowing observations: 1. That the *Greek* word  
*δυναστωα* (used in the *Septuagint*,) and the *Latin*  
*jus*, are never, in the inspired writings, taken  
 in the more rigorous, but in the more moderate  
 sense ; that is, not for power, but for authority  
 or right: 2. That there is nothing here set down  
 by *Samuel* that is simply forbidden by the law  
 of God, but what the best of Kings may do, as  
 the

(a) *Sherl. of resist.* p. 24. (b) *St. John* xviii. 36. (c)  
*B. Hoadl. serm. at Herif.* 22 *Mar.* 1707. (d) *Raleigh’s hist.*  
 fol. 393.

the publick occasions (a) require. 3. That these were plainly the prerogatives of the Kings of all the *eastern nations*, whom the *Jews* were here desirous to *be like*. 4. That this place is not to be understood of a tyranny, but of the natural state of the kingdom; as may appear, where *Samuel* telleth *Saul*, that he need not *set his mind on his asses that were (b) lost*, 'seeing whatsoever was 'good, pretious, and to be *desired* in all *Israel*, 'it did belong, in some sort, to him ——; ' (*meaning*) that it was now the part of all the 'people to contribute even of their best things 'to the King's uses, and the setting forth of his 'Majesty; yea, and that the King might lawfully exact of them things needful for these (c) 'purposes'. This does not therefore seem to be (as a celebrated preacher before quoted contends) such 'a very sad and lamentable account of the 'miseries and unhappineffes peculiarly belonging 'to absolute monarchy, and consequent upon 'the establishment of it, as must be a demonstration to all, who have not the most unworthy notions of Almighty God, that he could 'have no original design of appointing such a 'form of government, as the best, or as his own 'institution, sacredly and inviolably to be kept 'up in any nation, much less in all the nations 'of the (d) world'. That this was not so (I say) as he insists, needs no other proof, than what

P

is

(a) Bishop *Griff. Williams's* rights of Kings, &c. fol. 81. (b) 1 Sam. ix. 20. (c) Bishop *Morton's* Solomon, p 57, 58. (d) Bishop *Hoadly*, as before.



## 106 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

is already herein before made of the divine institution of this very form of Government: and that too *originally design'd*, and promised by God to his own chosen people, the *Israelites*, even before they had any being as a nation; and no other form of government ever once instituted, promised, or provided for them; and consequently as being *the best for all the nations in the world*. For 'it were impiety, to think, that God, who  
' was careful to appoint judicial laws for his chosen people, would not furnish them with the  
' best form of (a) government'. But for any person to affirm, that 'all the rest (except the government of the *judges*) can plead no more than  
' (b) permission', is an offence both against truth and modesty.

*Irresistible.* § XXIX. AND how sacredly and inviolably it was to be kept up, if not sufficiently prov'd already, will plainly appear, upon perusal of the words wherewith the prophet concludes this account of the right of Kings, saying, — *Ye shall cry out in that day, because of your King, which ye shall have chosen you, and the Lord will not bear you in that (c) day: ' that is, ' God*

(a) *Filmer's* pref. to the *Anarchy of limit. monarchy*. Where the same learned author well observes, that 'it is a shame and scandal for us *Christians*, to seek the original of government from  
' the inventions or fictions of poets, orators, philosophers, and  
' *heathen* historians, who all liv'd thousands of years after the  
' creation, and were (in a manner) ignorant of it; and to neglect  
' the scriptures, which have with more authority most particularly given us the true grounds and principles of government'.  
(b) *Bradb. serm.* 5 Nov. 1711, p. 12. (c) 1 *Sam.* viii. 18.

‘ God will not alter the government for you again,  
 ‘ how much soever you may complain of it. This  
 ‘ is a plain proof, that their Kings were invested  
 ‘ with that soveraign power, which must not be  
 ‘ resisted, though they oppress their subjects to  
 ‘ maintain their own (a) state’ &c. So that whe-  
 ther *Samuel* here describes a King or a tyrant,  
 it is all one in this point: for ’tis plain, the peo-  
 ple had nothing to do, but to obey their King;  
 and in case of his tyrannizing over them (since  
 he was their undoubted lawful King) they were  
 to have no remedy, but (such as the primitive  
 Christians had in those cases) prayers and tears.

‘ This is that doctrine of passive obedience,  
 ‘ which of late hath had so ill a sound among  
 ‘ many of us: but, I dare say, for no other rea-  
 ‘ son, but because it may have been by some  
 ‘ (b) misrepresented’. It has been call’d, the ‘ab-  
 ‘ solutely concluding whole nations under mi-  
 ‘ fery and slavery, without hopes of (c) redress’!  
 It has been ridicul’d, and reflected on, in divers  
 pamphlets, speeches and sermons, as a *pernicious*  
*and enslaving tenet; inconsistent with the law of*  
*reason, with the law of nature, and with the pra-*  
*ctice of all ages and countries; first invented to sup-*  
*port arbitrary and despotick power: and a brand of*  
*indelible (d) infamy* has been requir’d to be fasten’d

P 2

on

(a) *Sherl. case of resist.* p. 13. (b) *Archbishop Sharp’s serm.*  
 30 Jan. 1699, in 4to. p. 19. (c) *B. Hoadly’s serm.* 29 Sept.  
 1705, in 4to. p. 9. (d) No wonder, some men are so for-  
 ward to brand the doctrines of our blessed redeemer, when we  
 find

on it! As if it could not be *of God*, because it suits not with every man's notions of *liberty*! nay, we have been told, with great assurance, that 'a passive obedience would appear, upon examination, to be a much greater opposition to the will of God, than the (a) contrary'. But these learned persons have not yet prov'd how, and where, it would appear so; nor shew'd us when it was *first invented*. In such questions, we are not to have recourse to *Dutch* casuists and politicians; but to the law and to the (b) testimony: for where can we learn the will of God, but in his own revelation of it by his inspired writers? If they look only into this very place here before us, (which some of them would have to be the very *original standard*, or first institution of kingly government,) they will find a quite different declaration of the will of God: and if they look further, they will find, that their own notions of liberty were not known either in (c) *Job's*, or *Solomon's* days; but that as passive obedience under lawful authority is the express doctrine of the

find others so blasphemously audacious, as to declare in print, that the holy scriptures were of the clergies own inventing; and that if Jesus Christ laid the foundation of those powers (which these worse than *Jews* or *Infidels* are averse to,) 'the old *Romans* did him right in punishing him with the death of a SLAVE!' See an account of the growth of *deism* in England, 1696, p. 7. (commended by the author of the rights of the christian church asserted, p. 185.) as I find them both quoted, with a just abhorrence, in the second part of the wolf strips, &c. (by Mr. *Leslie*) 1707, p. 14, and 34.

(a) *B. Hoadly*, as before. (b) *Isa.* viii. 20. (c) *Job* xxxiv. 18. *Prov.* xx. 2. *Eccles.* viii. 2, &c.

the old (a) testament; so it is ' the doctrine also  
 ' of *Jesus Christ*, and that a necessary, indispen-  
 ' sible one (b) too'; and, as such, was the *practice*  
 and example of our great master himself, and of  
 his blessed apostles; from whose ' unerring practi-  
 ' ces and precepts, all true Christians must take  
 ' the measures of their actions, and the rules of  
 ' their life'; as those first converts did, *so long as*  
*Christianity continued pure and (c) unallay'd*. And  
 indeed, it seems very reasonable to believe, that  
 God Almighty did not lay before the people that  
 long list of the regal prerogatives, in order *to*  
*deter (d) them from* desiring the government of  
 absolute monarchs, as the Kings of *all nations*  
 were (as the celebrated (e) preacher frequently  
 quoted insinuates,) but rather to shew us, that  
 when we in our worldly wisdom, and under pre-  
 tence of publick good, take upon us to murmur  
 at, and cast off, such government and governours  
 as the Lord had appointed us, instead of better-  
 ing ourselves by such revolutions, we may rea-  
 sonably expect tyrants to rule us with rods of  
 iron; as has been frequently verified in most na-  
 tions of the world!

Never-

(a) *Stradl. serm. 30 Jan. 1674, p. 13.* (b) Archbishop  
*Sharpe, as before.* (c) *Burnet's serm. 6 Dec. 1674.* (d)  
 There are two powers of Kings plainly set forth in God's word.  
 The former is *potestas*; what he may and ought to do, in equity,  
*Deut. xvii.* The latter is *potentia*; what he may do, with impu-  
 nity, *1 Sam. viii.* The former is the King's rule for his own  
 conduct, for which he is answerable to God: the latter is the  
 people's rule for their obedience, for which they are answerable  
 both to God and the King; as is observ'd by divers good authors.  
 (e) *B. Hoadly's serm. at Hertf. 22 Mar. 1707.*



## 110 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

Nevertheless, the *Israelites* still persisting in their suit, *Samuel* proceeded to the providing a King for them; but (to take away all colour of the people's having any hand in it,) he first dissolv'd their unauthoriz'd (a) convention.

Saul's elec- § XXX. Now *the Lord* had told Sa-  
tion divine: muel in his ear, a day before Saul came, that he would send him a man, to be captain over his (b) people: and, when he did come, Samuel was so far from making him King even by his own authority, that (tho' he was both a prophet and a judge of *Israel*,) he did not so much as know him, any otherwise than by faith, till *the Lord* said unto him, behold the man whom I spake to thee of; this same shall reign over my (c) people. Accordingly Samuel took Saul (apart from all the people:) and when they were alone, anointed him in the name of *the* (d) Lord. And when he again called the people together unto *the* (e) Lord, he did it not for their consent or approbation, but only, by

(a) 1 Sam. viii. 22.

(b) ——— ix. 15.

(c) vers. 17.

Where the original word (which we translate to *reign over*) properly signifies (as the margin notes,) to *restrain in*: as if it had been said, *this same shall restrain my people*. For reigning is restraining: and so is all government a restraint of lawless liberty; which doubtless is the reason why the sons of *Belial* are never easy, under even the mildest of governours. (d) 1 Sam. x. 1. The *Hebrews* think, that *Saul* was not anointed with the same oil wherewith *David* and *Solomon* were anointed: for that was taken out of the tabernacle, but this was not; and that was pour'd out of a horn, denoting the durable state of their kingdom, but this only out of a brittle vial, denoting a short continuance. (e) 1 Sam. x. 17.

by the solemn casting of the lot (as is commonly suppos'd, tho' that does not appear in the text,) or by some other means of revealing or declaring the divine designation, to let them *see him whom the Lord had (a) chosen*.

Here it is very remarkable, and ought for ever to silence all the clamour of our fanaticks and republicans, on this head; that, in all this transaction, we do not find the least evidence, in any of these conventions, or general assemblies, of the people's ordering or resolving, or in any manner acting or assisting in this affair: further than this, that, after the *Lord*, (who has the *whole disposing (b) thereof* had caused his *lot*, or other mark of designation) to fall upon the same person, whom he had before anointed, and had directed the people to find him where he *had bid himself*, all the people shouted, and said, *God save the (c) King!* as doubtless they would have done, whosoever had been the person, since the having a King was what they only wanted and longed for. Nay, the very words of the text, *they* (that is the people) *inquired of the Lord (d) further*, (or, as it is in the *septuagint*, Samuel *inquired further of the Lord*) strongly imply some more direct and immediate application to the Lord in the whole transaction; at least, I'm sure, it plainly proves, that nothing was done therein without his express direction. Besides, that *Saul* was not so popular a man, as to have the common suffrage, and to be

(a) 1 Sam. x. vers. 24. (b) Prov. xvi. 33. (c) 1 Sam. x. 24. (d) — vers. 22.

## 112 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

be elected by the voice of the people, appears in this, that the *children of Belial* (who, by the way, are oftentimes the majority) mocked and *despised him*, instead of promoting his election. Neither was the *renewing the kingdom* afterwards in *Gilgal* (a) any more than the *people's* being summoned again by *Samuel*, to pay their duty of homage and allegiance to *Saul*, who was already their King by right divine. For *Saul* was both nominated and confirm'd King, and had also taken the exercise of the government upon him, and issued a more peremptory proclamation or (b) decree before this solemnity: and St. *Paul* himself declares the same, where he says, *they desired a King, and God gave unto them* (c) *Saul*.

And yet, for all this, certain persons are still pleas'd to insist, or insinuate, from this very case, (tho' nothing can be more clear to the contrary,) that 'God submitted *Saul* to their (the people's) election, in giving them the liberty to chuse the tribe and person by (d) lot! that 'he did not compel the people to accept *him*; having before left them free to chuse any one from among themselves to be their (e) King! that the people have an interest in agreeing to the form of their government, or electing the person that is to reign over (f) them! that Kings ought not to be set up over any people, but by their own consent, and at their own desire;

' and

(a) 1 *Sam.* xi. 14. (b) — 7. (c) *Acts* xiii. 21. (d) *Blakeway's* serm. *Novemb.* 1715, p. 19. (e) *J. Wright's* serm. at *Ailesb.* 15 *Mar.* 1719, p. 9. (f) *Whist.* script. pol. p. 26.

‘ and upon such foundations, as they themselves  
 ‘ solemnly agreed (a) to’! that when a King is  
 set over any people, there is not ‘ any obligation  
 ‘ of their continuing under such a form, any lon-  
 ‘ ger than the life-time of that King to whom  
 ‘ they voluntarily subjected (b) themselves’! &c.  
 nay, and one there is, who (notwithstanding his  
 great pretences to modern loyalty) has the assu-  
 rance to affirm, that ‘ *Saul* had no more than  
 ‘ heaven’s (c) connivance’! and will not allow  
 him so much as even the new-invented title of  
*providence*! Strange doctrines these! when, not  
 to insist upon its being censur’d by a convo-  
 cation, as a *great error* (d), the Holy Ghost him-  
 self has inspired the scripture-historian expressly to  
 assure us, that the form of government was ori-  
 ginally appointed them by the Lord, without the  
 people’s consent; agreement or desire, nay, and  
 even before they were a people, that they were  
 expressly forbid to set up any, but him *whom the*  
*Lord* himself *should chuse*; that this very King  
 was set up over them by God himself, without  
 their having the least knowledge of him, or  
 where to find him; that by the provisional pre-  
 cept above-mention’d, the people’s obligation of  
 obedience, is not to determine with the life of  
 their King, but to continue to his children after  
 him; and that (as to *Saul*) *Samuel* knew no more  
 of him than the rest of the people did, but as-

Q

fures

(a) *Whist. script. polit.* p. 27. (b) *Ibid.* p. 26. (c) *Bradb.*  
 5 Nov. 1711, p. 12. (d) *Bp. Overal's convocat. book*, l. i. c. 13.



tures us himself, that *the Lord* had chosen and set him King over them; (as) hath been here before particularly proved. Nay, Mr. *Whiston* has himself unwarily answer'd this objection, where he quotes scripture to prove, that 'during all ' the life of *Samuel*, *Saul* never thought his authority sufficiently safe and sacred, but when it ' was owned and supported by (a) *Samuel*, the prophet of the Lord. A plain evidence to me, that he knew his title and authority depended entirely upon God alone, and not upon the people; nothing being more natural (as experience tells us,) than for princes to depend upon those for their safety and settlement, from whom they receiv'd the sovereign power.

*His power absolute.* § XXXI. AND as the Lord had given them a King, so he also gave them (b) laws, whereby they were to be govern'd by him; not to limit the King's prerogative, or debase the sovereign power, so as to make him accountable to, and deposible by, the people: for he was vested with that absolute power, which the judges had also enjoy'd before him, that whosoever should disobey him, and not *hearken* unto his sentence or judgment, should be put to (c) death: which being so agreeable to that of *Samuel*, where he declares the right of the Kings and the duty of subjects, as is before recited, plainly teaches the duty and necessity of unconditional obedience (either

(a) *Whist.* script. polit. p. 27. (b) 1 Sam. x. 25. (c) *Deut.* xvii. 12.

(either active or passive) to lawful princes, and the unwarrantableness of resisting their persons or authority. And indeed (says one of our eminent historians) ' if practice do shew the greatness of authority, even the best Kings of *Judah* and *Israel* were not so tied by any laws, but that they did whatsoever they pleased in the greatest things, and commanded some of their own princes, and of their own brethren, to be slain, without any tryal of law, being sometime by prophets reprehended, sometime (a) not; but (as I may add from another author) never by the *Sanhedrim*, or states of the (b) realm. Yea, and Mr. *Stephens* himself confesses, that ' even in such a case as this, there can be no legal jurisdiction pretended to; no judicature remains, to judge of the prince's (c) actions: nothing being more ridiculous, than that a prince, in whom 'tis confess'd by all, the whole executive power of the law is lodg'd, should become legally accountable to his subjects, and answerable to that justice, which he alone has the right of (d) administering'. But, because there are many amongst us, who give too little credit to holy scripture and the opinions of divines, in these controversies, I shall add this observation from *Sigonius*, that *the power and authority of Kings did proceed, not so much from the laws, as from the arbitrement and will of the King: for they un-*

Q 2

*derstood*

(a) *Raleigh's hist.* fol. 393. (b) *Stillingsf. serm.* 30 Jan. 1668, p. 38. (c) *W. Steph. serm.* 30 Jan. 1693, p. 16. (d) *Ibid.* p. 159.

## 116 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

*derstood a King according to Aristotle's sense, who, being free from laws, might govern with the most plenary (a) right. And Herodotus tells us, that the Egyptians, 'as a modest admonition to their successors, did sit solemnly in judgment upon their Kings, after they were dead: before they put them into their sepulchres; a survey was made of their past reigns, and accordingly there pass'd a sentence of honour or dishonour on them; but to do it while they liv'd, is so presumptuous an abomination, as that nothing was able to provoke them to (b) it'. All which I would recommend to the serious consideration of the advocates of resistance, who exclaim against the principles of obedience as unnatural and servile; as well as to Mr. Whiston, who seems to insinuate a sort of a contract between Saul and the (c) people. A strange sort of a contract this! wherein the King was absolutely at his liberty to do what he pleas'd, and the people had no redress for their greatest grievances, but to cry unto the Lord (the only ruler of princes!) by whom he was set over them, and to whom alone he was accountable for his administration! tho', by this way of arguing, that scripture-politician may perhaps prove the people guilty of breaking the original*  
con-

(a) *Car Sigonius, de republ. Hebraeor. l. 7. c. 2. — Potestas atque auctoritas, quæ non tam a legibus, quam ab arbitrio & voluntate regis profecta sit: nam regem ipsi intellexerunt more Aristotelis, qui solutus legibus plenissimo jure regnaret.* (b) *Meggior's serm. 30 Jan. 1673, p. 14.* (c) *Whist. script. polit. p. 26.*

(a) contract, whenever they rebel against or resist their lawful prince, or use any other arms against him than prayers and tears, and *crying to the Lord*; which I'm persuaded is not his aim!

§ XXXII. BUT, to proceed. Amongst *And irre-*  
other passages of holy scripture, which *sistable.*  
are wrested in favour of the doctrine of resistance, great stress is laid, by some zealots, upon that where we read, that *Saul* having, by a rash vow, sentenc'd his eldest son *Jonathan* to death, *the people rescued Jonathan that he died* (b) not. But how groundless this argument is, appears in these several considerations. 1. That the people were so far from a rebellious disposition, that when their sovereign had *adjured them not to eat any food until evening*, they all religiously obey'd him, tho' they *were distress'd and* (c) faint; and were ready to *do whatsoever seemed good unto* (d) him. 2. They do not appear to have us'd any violence or force whatsoever, to *rescue* the son, or resist the father:  
but

(a) An eminent lawyer, on a late solemn occasion, hearing an *original contract* urg'd, to enforce the legality of resistance, express'd himself thus; ' When the original contract was made, that learn-  
' ed gentleman did not think fit to inform us. Was it before  
' *Magna Charta*? If so, why not compriz'd in it? — I never  
' met with it in any of our law-books. — I never heard it urg'd  
' in any court before. — I never heard it pleaded to any indict-  
' ment for high-treason. — And therefore, till the legislature have  
' declar'd what the original contract is, and determin'd what act  
' of the supreme executive power shall amount to a dissolution of  
' that original contract —, the law stands still upon the foot of  
' the 25th of *Edward III.*' &c. Mr. *Phipps*, in Dr. *Sachev.* trial,  
fol. 144. 145. (b) 1 *Sam.* xiv. 45. (c) — vers. 24, and  
28. (d) — vers. 36.



but all their arms were (a) *prayers*, entreaties, and rational arguments, representing to *Saul*, what a happy instrument *Jonathan* had been to *Israel*, in their obtaining so great a deliverance *that (b) day*; which, together with the consideration, that *Jonathan* had *not heard when his father* gave that (c) *charge*, was enough to prevail with any man to repent of a rash vow, and *rescue* an innocent person, tho' less dear to him than such a worthy son. 3. If the people had presum'd to press upon him *forcibly or mutinously*, 'tis confess'd, they had therein been *guilty of (d) sin*; and consequently this case can be nothing to the purpose which it is quoted for, in either light.

However, *Saul* not being the promised King of the house of *Judah*, *the Lord* (not the people) *rejected (e) him*, (or decreed, that the sceptre should be transferr'd from his family to that of *David*;) tho' not for tyranny over his subjects, but rather for too much clemency to his (f) *enemies*, whom the Lord had devoted to *utter destruction*; and for his

(a) The original word which we translate *rescued* is, by the seventy, interpreted *προσῆλθε*; which in other places of holy scripture is us'd for such humble and devout *prayers* as are put up to God himself: as in *Acts* viii. 15. — ix. 40. — xx 36, &c. (b) 1 *Sam.* xiv. 45. (c) — vers. 27. (d) *P. Martyr* in loc. (e) 1 *Sam.* xv. 23 and 26. — xvi. 1. (f) — xv. 3, &c. Here I must take notice of a republican teacher, who triumphs on *Samuel's* killing *Agag*: not for his doing it in pursuance of God's commandment, but because *Agag* was a King! and therefore (in his sense) 'there could not be a nobler conclusion to the publick actions of the judges, than to *hew a tyrant in pieces before the Lord*!' *Bradbury's* serm. 5 Nov. 1711, p. 24.

his presuming to offer the (a) burnt-offering of his own head, without waiting for Samuel. And therefore the Lord sent Samuel to the house of Jesse; and gave him particular instructions to anoint David there, whom he had provided for his (b) King. Not that David was hereby invested immediately with the kingly power: 'but this anointing was only a designation of him to succeed Saul after his death. So David always understood it; looking upon Saul as the Lord's anointed, as long as he lived; that is, as the King of (c) Israel'. Thus Saul being henceforward only tenant for life of the kingdom, and David (as the lawyers term it) reversioner in fee, the common interest of God's people was therefore, in an extraordinary manner, included in David's safety; and he was oblig'd to preserve himself, for the publick, as well as his own private welfare. And besides, Saul now degenerating daily, grew jealous of David, and sought by any means to take his life; hunting him from place to place, like a partridge in the (d) mountains; and moreover having massacred fourscore and five priests of the (e) Lord, as if he had design'd an utter extirpation of God's publick worship: yet, notwithstanding all his personal dangers and provocations, tho' he had not only self-preservation to engage him to a resistance, but also the common rights of all the kingdom (and particularly those

(a) 1 Sam. xiii. 8, &c. (b) — xvi. 1, &c. (c) Patrick's comment. (d) 1 Sam. xxvi. 20. (e) — xxii. 17, 18.

those of God's true religion) to challenge his protection, and wanted no courage to defend or avenge himself, in any cause that was good, he religiously avoided all occasions of exerting it against his sovereign, and shew'd himself most eminent in the practice of non-resistance. For, when he had *Saul* twice (as it were by miracle) in his power, and could at the same time, by one blow, have secur'd himself of the kingdom, as well as his life, he absolutely refus'd to hurt his sacred person, or to suffer his less-conscientious followers to do it; saying, *Destroy him not! for who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's anointed, and be (a) guiltless?* Surely *David* might (in these circumstances,) or else no body may! but he was so far from being illuminated with our new lights, that his conscience check'd him, and his heart smote him, because he had cut off *Saul's* (b) skirt (tho' he did that only to convince him how much more he had in his power to have done;) whereas our modern saints have no such qualms about the cutting off their King's head! Yea, *David* told *Abner* and his guards, they were *worthy to die*, (c) because they had kept their master no better: and he actually put the *Amalekite* to death, who said he had lent an hand to (d) slay him, tho' at his own request.

And

(a) 1 Sam. xxvi. 9. (b) — xxiv. 5: *Lycanus* tells us, it is to this day a tradition among the *Jews*, that *David* was punish'd in his death respectively to this sin, that no cloaths could keep him warm. And indeed there seems to be some ground for this, 1 Kin. i. 1. (c) 1 Sam. xxvi. 16. (d) 2 Sam. i. 14, &c.

And yet, notwithstanding all this, many popular writers and preachers take the liberty, to insist upon *the lawfulness*, and even *the necessity of self-defence*, and of *direct resistance*, of *private subjects to their Kings*, in *cases of extremity*, &c. (as Mr. *Whiston* has observ'd, and rebuk'd one of them for). 'Perhaps (says he) there may be some cases, in which this self-defence may not be unlawful: however, I can hardly, I confess, find this matter clear enough in scripture, to warrant a Christian's practice upon that foot (a)'. Thus far Mr. *Whiston*. But a worthy *Rector of St. Peters-poor, London*, goes much further in his censure of this Doctrine; and says, 'were I to set up for a publick patron of wickedness, I hardly know a villany in nature so black and monstrous, which I could not more plausibly recommend to men's reason and consciences, than this of resistance against lawful authority, which is— enough to nauseate any conscience, but a devil's (b)'. And a truly reverend bishop of *Sarum* did not scruple to say of this popular pretence, that 'it is, in respect of policy and government, what the *sin against the Holy Ghost* is to c) religion'. And indeed, tho' it would not be so strange in others, yet for those who appear in the habits and orders of the Church of *England*, to fly so openly in the face of her

R

known

(a) Script. polit. dedic. p. iv. (b) Dr. *Scott's* serm. 26 Jul: 1685, p. 14, in 4to. (c) Dr. *Ward's* serm. 5 Nov. 1661, p. 33, in 4to.



known (a) doctrines, is very surprizing. For,  
 ‘ blessed be God, our church hates and condemns  
 ‘ this doctrine, from what hand soever it come,  
 ‘ and hath established the rights and authority of  
 ‘ princes on sure and unalterable foundations,  
 ‘ enjoying an entire obedience to all the lawful  
 ‘ commands of authority, and an absolute sub-  
 ‘ mission to that supreme power God hath put in  
 ‘ our soveraign’s hands. This doctrine we just-  
 ‘ ly glory in: and if any, that had their baptism  
 ‘ and education in our church, have turn’d re-  
 ‘ negades from this, they prov’d no less enemies  
 ‘ to the church herself, than to the civil autho-  
 ‘ rity: so that their apostacy leaves no blame on  
 ‘ our church; which glories in nothing more  
 ‘ than in a well-temper’d reformation, from the  
 ‘ later corruption which the dark ages brought  
 ‘ in, to the pure and primitive doctrines, which  
 ‘ our Saviour and his apostles taught, and the  
 ‘ first Christians retained and practised for many  
 ‘ (b) ages’. And so our *Homilies*, approv’d by  
 the *articles* of our religion, for godly and wholesome  
 doctrine, and necessary for these (c) times, do ex-  
 pressly deny the lawfulness, as well as necessity, of  
 either resistance or self-defence against the lawful  
 power: and that too grounded upon this very  
 case now before me; arguing, that, tho’ ‘ King  
 ‘ *Saul* was not of the best, but rather of the  
 ‘ worst

(a) That passive-obedience and non-resistance are the doctrines of the church of *England*, was fully given in evidence, at the trial of Dr *Sacheverel*, fol. 154, &c. (b) Dr. *Burnet*’s serm. 6 Dec. 1674, (reprinted 1710) in 8vo, p. 47. (c) Art. xxxv.

‘ worst sort of princes, as being out of God’s  
 ‘ favour, — and sought the destruction of *David*  
 ‘ by all means possible ; and tho’ *David* was then  
 ‘ the very best of all subjects — highly and sin-  
 ‘ gular in the favour of God, — as well as of  
 ‘ the people — and by God appointed to reign  
 ‘ after *Saul*: yet (for all this) he would not even  
 ‘ save his life by rebellion or any resistance, but  
 ‘ by flight, and hiding himself from the King’s  
 ‘ (a) sight’, &c. Much less did he ever ‘ seize  
 ‘ upon him to carry him prisoner, to be tried by  
 ‘ the *Sanhedrin*: nor is there any foundation for  
 ‘ any such power in the *Sanhedrin*, over the per-  
 ‘ sons of their sovereigns; it neither being con-  
 ‘ tained in the grounds of its institution, nor any  
 ‘ precedent occurring in the whole story of the  
 ‘ bible; which gives the least countenance to it.  
 ‘ Nay several passages of scripture utterly over-  
 ‘ throw it: for, how could *Solomon* have said,  
 ‘ where the word of a King is, there is power, and  
 ‘ who may say unto him, what dost thou (b)? if,  
 ‘ by the constitution of their government, the  
 ‘ *Sanhedrin* might have controlled him, in what  
 ‘ he said or (c) did’?

There were not wanting some about him, to  
 insinuate unto him, that providence had put the  
 King into his power, that by his destruction the  
 throne might be vacant for himself to ascend;  
*Behold the day of which the Lord said unto thee,*

R 2

be

(a) *Homily against wilful rebellion, second part.* (b) *Ecclef.*  
 viii. 4. (c) *Stillingfl. serm. 30 Jan. 1668, p. 37.*

## 124 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

*behold I will deliver thine enemy into thine hand, that thou mayst do to him as it shall seem good unto thee* (a). — *God hath deliver'd thine enemy into thine hand this day* (b). And some of our modern politicians would probably have told him, that 'tame to sit still — is a tacit consent to the ruin and misery of mankind, whose publick peace and happiness is the sole end of (c) government'. And, 'tis certain, *David* 'might have pleaded necessity and providence as much as ever any could (d)', when he was thus persecuted by *Saul*, and the persecutor strangely deliver'd into his hands; and might especially have imputed all his sufferings to the advice of evil counsellors, while *Doeg*, the *Edomite* (e), was at the King's ear: and yet we find, he had another opinion of the person and authority of even a bad King, and other notions of God and his providence; and therefore acted upon this, which 'must be a settled principle, that the providence of God will never justify any action which his law (f) forbids'. But he 'was not so well tutor'd in the art of rebellion, as to secure himself this way, and wanted some of our new masters to instruct him in (g) it'! For, looking upon it only as a trial and probation of him, and that nothing could be necessary for him to do that was not lawful in itself; and likewise 'knowing full

(a) 1 Sam. xxiv. 4. (b) — xxvi. 8. (c) B. Hoadly's serm. 29 Sept. 1705, p. 13. in 4to. (d) Stillingfl. serm. 30 Jan. 1668, p. 36. (e) 1 Sam. xxii. 9, &c. (f) Sherl. case of resist. p. 30. (g) Heylin's rebels catechism, 1643, p. 15.

‘ full well, that the bare prediction of this, did  
 ‘ not authorize him to execute it, without a com-  
 ‘ mand (a), *The Lord forbid (said he) that I should*  
*do this thing unto my master, the Lord’s anointed,*  
*to stretch forth mine hand against him, seeing he is*  
*(tho’ not a good King, yet nevertheless) the anoint-*  
*ed of the (b) Lord.*—*Wickedness proceedeth from the*  
*wicked, but mine hand shall not be upon thee (c).*  
 —*As the Lord liveth, the Lord shall smite him,*  
*or his day shall come to die, or he shall descend into bat-*  
*tle and perish; the Lord forbid, that I should stretch*  
*forth mine hand against the Lord’s anointed (d)!*  
 Thereby clearly intimating, that as the Lord  
 had set *Saul* in the throne, so it must be the act  
 of the Lord alone (and not that of man) which  
 was to make the throne vacant. In a word; as  
*Saul* had not the kingdom given him, nor any  
 condition impos’d upon him, by the people; so  
 neither could his transgressions be deem’d a for-  
 feiture of his sovereignty to them: and therefore,  
 even after *Samuel* had denounc’d his rejection in  
 the name of the Lord, and it was publickly (e)  
 known that *David* was anointed to be his Succes-  
 sor, *Samuel* continued to pray, and to mourn, for  
*Saul*, and to do him *honour* (as usual) *before his*  
*(f) people.* ‘ He did not forget (as some of us  
 ‘ do) his own doctrine of passive-obedience, which  
 ‘ (g) formerly he had preach’d unto (h) them’; and  
 much

(a) *Rye’s treat against the nonjur.* vol. 2, p. 633. (b) 1 *Sam.*  
 xxiv. 6. (c) — *vers.* 13. (d) — *xxvi.* 10, 11. (e)  
 — *xxv.* 30. (f) — *xv.* 31, &c. (g) — *viii.* 18.  
 (h) *Symmons’s* *loy. subj.* 1643, p. 56.



much less did he incite them to relieve themselves by resistance : but, what he had before laid down by precept, he now taught them by his own example ; in obedience to which, *Saul* was still respected as their undoubted sovereign (by *David* as well as by all the people,) till God, his only superior, depriv'd him at once of his life and kingdom. After all which, I can't but admire at those, who would insinuate a distinction between the *resistance of private and publick persons, and between private and publick injuries* ; as if our church in her homilies, had condemn'd the one, but determin'd nothing in case of the (a) other ! Surely, *David* was more than a private person, and the injuries before-mention'd to be committed by *Saul*, were more than merely personal and private ; and therefore, as our church has largely set forth that case, as an example of that obedience which she requires of subjects to their lawful sovereigns, we can't fairly deny that she has condemn'd resistance of authority, without any such distinctions as would render all obedience arbitrary or precarious.

David, a  
King by di-  
vine right.

§ XXXIII. Now, after God's providence had open'd the way to it, and made the throne vacant, by the death of *Saul*, then, and not before, was *David*, by the Lord's express (b) direction, anointed King in *Hebron*, where he reign'd over the house of Judah  
seven

(a) *Nat. Marsh*: def. of our constit. p. 142.  
ii. 1, &c.

(b) 2 *Sam.*

*seven years and six months* (a): but the rest of the tribes for some time, adher'd to *Ishbosheth*, the next known heir of the family of *Saul* (for *Mephibosheth*, the son of *Jonathan*, was not to be (b) found,) as of course to succeed to the throne, according to the law of nature; till, becoming thoroughly sensible of the Lord's express designation of *David*, they came together to him, and anointed him King over *Israel* (c) also. And this was undoubtedly the true reason, why *Mephibosheth* never disputed *David's* title, and not a disregard to his own natural right of inheritance, which he knew must yield to an express title from God himself. But *Abner's* conduct, in this great affair, is worth our serious reflection. He had been captain of *Saul's* (d) host, and was also his near kinsman, and a most valiant (e) man. But, upon the death of *Saul*, tho' he well knew of *David's* divine appointment to the succession, yet his own ambition, or other private motives, induced him to set up *Ishbosheth* as King over all (f) *Israel*, and to maintain a long and bloody war even against what he knew God had engag'd himself to bring about: and yet, no sooner did a private quarrel happen between *Ishbosheth* and him,

(a) 2 Sam. ii. 11. But this is not to be understood, as if *David* had so long reign'd over *Judah* only; for *Ishbosheth* reign'd but two years, and after his death, all *Israel* came in to *David*: but I reckon these *seven years and six months* from his settling at *Hebron*, till his conquest and removal to *Jerusalem*. (b) 2 Sam. ix. 3, 4. (c) — v. 1, &c. (d) 1 Sam. xiv. 50. (e) — xxvi. 15. (f) 2 Sam. ii. 8.

him, but then presently, *So do God to Abner, and more also, except, as the Lord hath sworn to David, even so I do to him; to translate the kingdom from the house of Saul, and to set up the throne of (a) David, &c.* Thus he could do, out of resentment, what he would not do for religion. Which confirms a just remark of an eminent doctor, that ‘no obligations, tho’ the most signal and  
 ‘divine, will hold men in obedience and peace,  
 ‘if their ambitions or interests look another way:  
 ‘and if at any time, present advantage, or an  
 ‘expectation, or some passion, do incline them  
 ‘to seek David their King; yet, the appearance  
 ‘of a change of interest, that expectation defeated, or a cross-animosity, will burst those  
 ‘bonds, unless religion, and communion in worship, help to twist (b) them’.

Now, when *all the tribes of Israel came to David unto Hebron*, we read, that *King David made a league with (c) them*, which some people have mistaken for an original contract, yet we cannot understand it so, or of his submitting to any terms or limitations, to cramp his authority: but, as *the Lord had said to David, Thou shalt feed my people Israel, and thou shalt be ruler over my people Israel, therefore came all the elders of Israel to the King to Hebron — according to the word of the Lord by Samuel (d);* not to elect, nor to confirm, but only to recognize his divine right, and to pay their

(a) 2 Sam. iii. 9, &c. (b) *Allestr. ferm.* vol. 1, 1684, fol. 231. (c) 2 Sam. v. 1, &c. (d) *Ibid.* and 1 Chron. xi. 2.

their homage and allegiance to the Kings, as the ordinance of God: and David perceived that the Lord (not the people) had established him King over Israel (a); and accordingly, the Lord saith, I have found David my servant, with my holy oil have I anointed him (b).

After all this, with what colour of scripture, reason, or good sense, *David* can be said to have been 'call'd to the throne by God, and the voice of the people (c)', I own myself at a loss to understand; since nothing can be plainer than that, neither the Lord, nor his Prophet, ever once asked the people's voice or consent, nor desir'd their concurrence thereunto: nay, and further, that *David* was so far from being popular, that even when he offer'd himself afterwards to fight in the common cause against *Goliath*, neither the King himself, nor his General, knew so much as *whose son he (d) was*, till they were told by his own mouth.

§ XXXIV. AND tho' *David* had, *Absolute and thro' human frailty, (or perhaps thro' irresistible.* the advice of evil counsellors!) fallen into the grievous sins of adultery and (e) murder, each of which alone was capital, in ordinary persons, by the law of (f) God himself; yet we don't find the least attempt made by the people, to call him to account for it; nor any of the Lord's prophets

S

de-

(a) 2 Sam. v. 12. (b) Psa. lxxxix. 20. (c) Dr. Chandler. serm. 7 June, 1716, p. 3, in 8vo. (d) 1 Sam. xvii. 55. (e) 2 Sam. xi. (f) Levit. xx. 10. Deut. xxii. 22. Numb. xxxv. 31, &c.



# 130 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

declaring, that, upon his falling into sin, he had forfeited his right of dominion, and ought to be depos'd, as our modern fanaticks, and some of the worst of papists do pretend. Had *David* liv'd in our days, and committed such sins, (unless he had been, on other accounts, a particular favourite of the party,) it would probably have been asserted, that 'that governour  
' who — is not a terror to evil works, but to good,  
' who is not the minister of good to the virtuous,  
' and of vengeance to the wicked only, and who  
' is not continually watching for the good and happiness of humane society, is not the governor  
' — (to whom obedience is due;) and much less,  
' if he manifestly act contrary to the only end  
' of his (a) institution: ' — that governours  
' cannot, in such instances, be call'd God's vicegerents without the highest prophaneness; and  
' therefore to oppose them, in such cases, cannot be to oppose the authority of God (b) '! &c.  
How nearly the close application of this might have affected a prince, who had broke through the express laws of God, to gratify his own vicious appetites, is manifest enough. But such doctrines were not then taught by the Lord's prophets: neither is there the least colour of proof, that the *Sanhedrim* (or states of the nation) ever pretended to any right to take cognizance of these things; for 'it is ridiculous to think,  
' that high court could controul their (c) King'.  
And

(a) *B. Hoady's* serm. 29 Sept. 1705, p. 7.

(b) *Ibid.* p. 13.

(c) *Patrick*, on 1 Sam. viii. 18.

And yet we find, that princes, tho' not accountable to their subjects, have however a superior, to whom they must render a strict account of their administration, and who will, here or hereafter, severely chastise the *mightiest* of them, for all abuses of their power and his authority; which is enough to keep the greatest tyrant in (*a*) awe!

Thus, in the case before us, the Lord himself takes the matter into his own hand, and sends the prophet *Nathan* to *David*, to summon him before himself as his judge, and to denounce a (*b*) sentence adequate even to the very circumstances of his crimes. For, whereas 'he had dared to *take*  
' to his bed the *wife* of another man, the prophet  
' plainly tells him, another should go to bed to  
' *his wives*; whereas he, a publick person, had  
' *secretly* done so foul an act, the prophet tells  
' him, *his wives* should be adulterated openly,  
' *before all Israel*, and even *in the sight of the sun*!  
' yea, whereas he had dar'd by an unjust *sword* to  
' *slay* a subject, God sends him word, *The sword shall*  
' *never depart from thy house*! and indeed all this  
' was verified in his rebellious darling, in his  
' lovely son, his son (*c*) *Abshalom*'. And yet, when this message had, by God's grace, thoroughly rous'd *David*, and awaken'd his conscience, to bring him to a sincere repentance; even then, in his penitential confession to God Almighty, he says, *against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and*

S 2

done

(*a*) Satis illi erit ad poenam, quod Deum habeat ultorem, *Bract.*  
See also *Wisdom* vi. 1, &c. (*b*) 2 *Sam.* xii. 1, &c. (*c*) 7.  
*Allington's* serm. 6 *Apr.* 1660, p. 7, E.

## 132 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

*done this great (a) evil!* not that he can be suppos'd to have been insensible of his sin, with respect to the innocent and loyal *Uriah* in particular, or to the whole people in general, by the scandal of his *(b)* example : but because he knew, that, being a lawful King, he was subordinate only to God, and accountable to him alone, in respect of punishment. ' If therefore we own  
' the scriptures for our Guide in all doubtful and  
' important points (*as all of us still pretend to do,*)  
' here is an instance to guide us in a matter of  
' this great and weighty *(c)* moment '. But alas!  
' tho' the good actions, and their rewards, are  
' enroll'd for our imitation ; the evil, and their  
' punishment, for our terror : yet have we some  
' in our times, that seem to have been conversant  
' with the sacred scriptures, only to learn how  
' to be conscientiously wicked, and to sin by pattern ; that weed out the worst deeds of men  
' there mention'd, to be a scheme for their practice —. A pregnant instance of which is the  
' unnatural rebellion mention'd in this and the  
' subsequent *sections*, and its exact agreement with  
' our times ; it seeming to be a history of our  
' days under borrow'd *(d)* names '.

§ XXXV. DAVID, having thus happily wash'd away those heinous sins, by a true repentance and humiliation, he is recorded, in the holy scripture, to have *executed judgment and justice unto all his*  
peo-

(a) *Psa.* li. 4. (b) *Regis ad exemplum, &c.* (c) *P. Latham's* serm. 29 *June*, 1683. p. 32. (d) *T. Heyricks's* serm. 26 *Jul.* 1685, p. 2.

(a) people; because he did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside from any thing that he commanded him all the days of his life, save only in the matter of (b) Uriah: and as such is propos'd as a pattern for his son Solomon to walk (c) by, and made the standard by which the succeeding Kings were judged. How  
 ver, there wanted not an enemy, even <sup>Yet rebell'd</sup> against by his <sup>son Absalom.</sup> of his own blood, to rebel against him, and usurp his kingdom. For Absalom, his son, was forwarded by his own ambition, to conspire against him; and made use of the common arts and specious pretences of rebels, to steal the hearts of the men of (d) Israel from their lawful King. In order to which, having prepar'd chariots and horses, he sets about to render himself popular; declaring to every one who came to the court for justice, that his cause was good and right, but there was no man deputed of the King to hear (e) him: thereby traiterously insinuating, that there were many and great defects in his father's administration! that the King regarded not to do his subjects justice! that there was great cause of complaint given! but withal, how careful and diligent he himself would be to redress all grievances, if once he had it in his power. Ob (said he) that I were made judge (meaning the supreme judge) in the land, that every man, which hath any suit or cause, might come unto me, and I would do him (f) justice! but, tho' the giddy populace

(a) 2 Sam. viii. 15. (b) 1 Kin. xv. 5. (c) 2 Chron. vii. 17, 18. (d) 2 Sam. xv. 6. (e) — vers. 3. (f) — vers. 4.



pulace (who are too fond of revolutions,) did not see through the fallacy, it was plain enough by his address to them, and not to the King himself, that his real design was only to supplant his father in their affections, in order to usurp his throne: and what good can reasonably be expected from those, who will do wrong to one, under pretence of having thereby an opportunity of doing right to (a) others?

To this pretence of publick good, on the one hand, the subtle *Abalom* added that of religion and liberty of conscience, on the other. He told the King, he had made a *vow to serve the Lord in Hebron, and pray'd his leave to go to perform* (b) it: whereas, in truth, it was only to get the better opportunity to *send spies throughout all the tribes of* (c) *Israel*, to have his rebellious adherents in readiness to attend him. Thus that, which teacheth nothing but the most dutiful obedience, is perverted to sanctify downright rebellion; till  
at

(a) It was an excellent remark (worthy of its reputed author,)  
 ‘ that a good aim, much less a good pretence, cannot justify a  
 ‘ bad action: and therefore we ought to be as solicitous about  
 ‘ the lawfulness of the means, as about the goodness of the end.  
 ‘ It is a maxim in morality, that *bonum oritur ex integris*; and  
 ‘ in Christianity, that *we must not do evil that good may come of*  
 ‘ *it*: and we may possibly rescue ourselves from future couzenage,  
 ‘ if we examine the lawfulness of every circumstance leading to  
 ‘ the end propounded, before we are tickled and transported with  
 ‘ the beauty of the pretence’. *Modern policies taken from Ma-*  
 ‘ *chiavel, &c.* 1653, in 8vo. p. 31. (suppos'd by Dr. *Saunders*,  
 ‘ afterwards Archbishop of *Canterbury*.) reprinted 1690, in 4to,  
 ‘ p. 7. (b) 2 *Sam.* xv. 7, 8. (c) — ver. 10.

at length the poor deluded people become as devoutly wicked, as those (intimated by an ingenious writer) who could 'fire a pistol in their prince's face, whilst they were repeating the fifth (a) 'commandment'! But this is not strange: for 'they, who level at the government, always disguise those aims with the fair and specious colours of maintaining endanger'd religion, liberty, and property; while they have no sense of the first, intend to oppress the second, and seize on the (b) third'.

Nevertheless, by these and such like artificies, the *conspiracy* became *strong* and *general*: *for the people increas'd continually with Absalom; tho' many of them went with him in their simplicity, and knew not any (c) thing they were to do, or at least never consider'd the fatal consequences of what they were engag'd in.* Among those who join'd in this unnatural expedition, the principal was *Achitophel*, one of *David's* counsellors, ('or the 'president, (d) it's possible, of that honourable 'board';) whose name will therefore be infamous to all posterity, next to that of *Judas*, of whom he is not improperly said to be a (e) *type*. As for the rest, in general, they may be suppos'd to have been the very dregs of the people; since rebellion, properly so call'd, is fitly compar'd to a *common-sewer*, into which all the kennels of the nation, naturally (f) *run*.

(a) *Lewis's* scourge, no. 5. (b) *Dr. J. Fitz-William's* serm. 9 Sept. 1683, p. 13. (c) 2 *Sam.* xv. 11, 12. (d) *Achitophel's* policy defeated; a serm. 9 Sept. 1683, p. 10. (e) *T. Long's* serm. 9 Sept. 1683, p. 5. (f) *Dr. Scott's* serm. 26 July, 1685, p. 25, 26.

# 136 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

Thus *David*, by the sudden increase of his enemies, and the base desertion of some of his most obliged friends, was reduc'd to the necessity, not only to abdicate the government, but even to *flee* for his life, and to *escape* beyond (a) *Jordan*: and the good King *wept as he went up, and had his head cover'd, and he went barefoot, and all the people that was with* (b) *him*. And well he might be thus affected. For tho' he had been train'd up from his youth in the school of affliction (wherein many princely virtues are best to be (c) learn'd) and, even after he was anointed, was not admitted by God to the exercise of his kingly power, till he had spent some years under this discipline; tho' *the evils which compass'd him about were* (d) *innumerable*; and *his enemies who hated him wrongfully were* (e) *strong and mighty, and more than the hairs of his* (f) *head*; tho' he was revil'd by people of all sorts, from the gravest who *sate in the gate* (or place of judicature,) and *spake against him*, down to the very *drunkards*, who made *songs* (and libels) *upon* (g) *him*: yet nothing of all this touch'd him so home, as when his own flesh and blood conspir'd his ruin; when *his own familiar friend in whom he trusted, which did eat of his bread, had lift up his heel against* (h) *him*; which

(a) 2 Sam. xv. 14. — xvii. 22. (b) — xv. 30. (c) The learned bishop Merley, speaking of *David* being a man after God's own heart, says, 'perhaps it was his breeding in this school that made him to be so'. Merley's serm. at the coron. of King Charles II. 1661, p 53, in 4to. (d) Ps. xl. 12. (e) — xxxviii. 19. (f) — lxix. 4. (g) — vers. 12. (h) — xli. 9.

which he elegantly complains of (a); ‘where he  
‘ bemoans his own present distress, and the perfidiousness of his own principal servants and  
‘ counsellors, who, with *Absalom*, fought his life  
‘ and (b) crown’.

Upon this abdication or desertion of his throne (if that may be so call’d (c) which was occasion’d by a just apprehension of danger to his person,) *Absalom*, with his party came to (d) *Jerusalem*, and was permitted by God, for the sins of the nation, to take possession of the vacant throne, and of the whole kingdom, from *Dan* even to (e) *Beer-sheba*; so that, for some time, the usurper had every thing but God and justice on his side, and the loyalists had not force sufficient to make head against him, in behalf of their exil’d King! but, to their immortal honour let it be remember’d, that *Zadok* (f) and *Abiathar*, and all the priests and levites retain’d their natural allegiance, and continued stedfast in loyalty to their sovereign *David*. ‘ They had not learnt the new doctrine of  
‘ resistance, nor did they act by the politick rule  
‘ of our modern *Laodiceans*, who really neither  
‘ espouse the King’s cause, nor the faction of his  
‘ enemies; but stand aloof off, till they may,  
‘ with discretion, join themselves to the stronger  
‘ side. *Zadok* and *Abiathar* were as wise as they,  
‘ but more honest; and tho’ they were God’s  
T ‘ priests,

(a) *Psa.* lv. 12, &c. (b) Bishop *Sheldon*’s serm. 28 *June*, 1660, p. 8. (c) Bishop *Burnet* says, certainly it cannot be call’d so; as I have noted upon p. 37. (d) 2 *Sam.* xvi. 15. (e) — xvii. 11. (f) — xv. 24.



## 138 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

‘ priests, yet continued the King’s loyal subjects  
 ‘ in his greatest distress and utmost extremity.  
 ‘ — I wish that some who term themselves *mini-*  
 ‘ *sters of the gospel* would acquit themselves, in  
 ‘ this respect, as well as these (howsoever despis’d)  
 ‘ *priests of the (a) law* ! for this their loyalty was  
 perhaps the main human cause, that this rebellion  
 of *Abshalom* (as well as that of *Sheba*, which  
 soon follow’d it) was of a short continuance ; God  
 having so guarded the government of his own  
 people, by a strict conformity and uniformity,  
 that, without a schism in the church, no rebel-  
 lion against the King could long continue.

Now, when treason rode triumphant among  
 the multitude, and faith was but to be found  
 among the few, the treacherous *Ziba* took his op-  
 portunity to betray his loyal master (*b*) *Mephi-*  
*bosheth* ; and the foul-mouth’d *Shimei* presum’d to  
 cast stones at his sovereign Lord the King, and  
 to curse (*c*) him even to his face ! It does not  
 appear, that this miscreant had receiv’d any per-  
 sonal injury, or any just provocation, thus to in-  
 sult his lawful sovereign in his distress ; and there-  
 fore we may fairly suppose, that the corruption  
 of his own heart was the only reason, that he took  
 the advantage of the times, (as other time-servers  
 are apt to do,) which then did favour every  
 one that would be the King’s enemy. But if he  
 had been so provok’d, the law of God was very  
 express

(a) *Achitophel*’s policy defeated ; A serm. 9 Sept. 1683, p. 26,  
 27. (b) 2 Sam. xvi. 1, &c. (c) ——— vers. 5, 6.

(a) express against reviling the Lord's anointed; which in the holy scriptures is call'd (b) *blasphemy*: and therefore, tho' *David* himself (through the clemency natural to lawful Kings) was so gracious as to forgive him, yet God Almighty, who looks upon any injury done to them as done to himself, (whose authority they have,) would not hold him guiltless, but return'd his wickedness upon his own head, and brought it down to the grave with (c) blood. And yet, 'for one *Shimei* in *David's* time, we have a (d) thousand in our days'. But it is remarkable, that immediately upon this happy restoration, this blasphemer of the Lord, and of his anointed, was among the very first, who hasted (e) to make a formal submission to the King, and address him for mercy; which (however undeserved) he readily obtain'd of him. For tho' *David* return'd upon his own terms, yea, even in conquest, with the sword in his hand, and might have justly made many examples of his vengeance; yet, like a true father to them, he passes an act of indemnity to all his people, and would not strike off this very wretch, who had so highly try'd his patience, tho' some about him had press'd him earnestly to do it. Upon which case, I find a remark of a modern divine, which

T 2

I think

(a) *Exod.* xxii. 28. (b) 1 *Kim.* xxi. 10, 13. (c) — ii. 9.  
 (d) *Heyrick's* serm. 26 *July*, 1685, p. 4. And (as *Sir J. Hayward* tells the Jesuit *Parsons*,) *Shimei* did not half so cruelly curse or revile holy *David*, as those do who charge him with resistance against *Saul*; which he detested. *Hayw*, answ. to *Doleman*, 1603, p. 90.  
 (e) 2 *Sam.* xix. 16, &c.

# 140 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

I think well worthy of remembrance. Speaking of *Shimei's* cursing, and *David's* patience under it, as if *the Lord* had not only permitted, but expressly *bidden him* do it; and his pious confidence that *the Lord* would requite him good for (a) it; he  
 ‘ offers it to be consider’d, when the provocations  
 ‘ of a people are so very clamorous and importunate, that nothing can befall them but as a  
 ‘ pointed providence, and they can never be to  
 ‘ seek why God’s hand is upon them; whether,  
 ‘ in case their Prince should abuse his power, it  
 ‘ would not become them, instead of meditating resistance, to say rather, *let him alone, for*  
 ‘ *God has bidden him*: and I will be bold to add,  
 ‘ that they may say this, with at least as good  
 ‘ reason, as *David* could of *Shimei*; since it’s so  
 ‘ very plain, that even evil princes are the ordinance of (b) God,’ &c.

Abfalom’s revolution - principles expos’d.

§ XXXVI. THIS revolution (tho’ in truth a most unnatural rebellion and treasonable usurpation, and reported as such in the sacred records,) had nevertheless its false prophets, impudent enough to impute it all to God’s providence, *and the Lord’s doing! The Lord* (said *Shimei*) *hath deliver’d the kingdom into the hand of Abfalom thy* (c) *son*. Such as he could

(a) 2 Sam. xvi. 10, &c. (b) Mr. D Oly’s serm. at Bath, 17 Sept. 1710, p. 20, in 4to. (c) 2 Sam. xvi. 8. Several of our late eminent divines having taken occasion to apply this case to that of a later *Abfalom* (which was happily suppress’d,) have elegantly describ’d the consequences naturally attending such rebellion.

could behold God's band, and visible marks of providence in all this ! (like those miserable interpreters of God's word herein before (a) mention'd;) whereas 'tis certain, his incest and usurpation were equally from God's permission, and the Lord was no more the author of the one than the other: nay (as a late popular writer frankly observes) ' there is as plain and as legible (b) scripture, to ' entitle him to the bloody *French* and *Irish* massacres, as there is to make him the setter-up of ' divine (c) usurpers! — To deny God's providence, is to shut him out of his own world; ' but to ascribe wicked actions to the divine providence, is the greater injury of the two. For ' the

lion, whenever it is permitted to succeed: how, ' God should ' have been entituled the author, and be mock'd with a thanksgiving-day for the success! the actors had been honour'd as patriots and saints! the protestant religion had — receiv'd another ' indelible blot! and — heresy, hypocrisy, and regicide been made ' the publick profession and religion of the nation! T. Long's serm. 9 Sept. 1683, p. 35, 36. ' We had quickly seen a flourishing kingdom — seiz'd on, eaten up by lice; by a swarm ' of the basest and most infamous vermin that ever bred out of ' the filth of a nation! we had seen the Athiest glutting his lust ' with the rapes of our wives and daughters, and quaffing the ' tears of widows and orphans! we had seen the beggar on ' horseback flaunting in the spoils of our fortunes, and triumphing on the heads of our nobles and gentry! in a word, we had ' seen our laws trampled on, our liberties enslav'd, and our yet sacred and virgin throne, to our everlasting infamy, deflower'd ' and profan'd by a spurious illegitimate issue! Dr. Scott's serm. 26 July, 1685, p. 26, 27.

(a) Page 92. (b) *The Lord killeth, and maketh alive.* 1 Sam. ii. 6. (c) *Sam. Johnf.* argum. proving the abrogat. of K. James, 1692, pref. p. 15.



## 142 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

‘ the *Engliff* of God’s providence is, as God  
‘ would have it. Now, when this is applied to  
‘ usurpation, which is robbery and wrong in the  
‘ highest degree, — ’tis to say, that robbery is  
‘ as God would have it, and oppression is as God  
‘ would have it! but this, all the world knows, is  
‘ contrary to God’s known and revealed will;  
‘ and therefore as the Atheists deny God, so  
‘ these men make him to deny (a) himself’. And  
what less violence do those offer to the divine  
majesty, who presume notoriously to wrest the  
holy scriptures, (and particularly the case here  
before us,) to favour such resistance as is there-  
in expressly condemn’d? Yet so did the trum-  
peters of rebellion, within the memory of man,  
endeavour to justify their own party by the mis-  
applied example of *David*, and condemn their  
King’s conduct under the person of *Abfalom*: as  
if *Abfalom*’s sin had only consisted in his *rising up*  
*against the* (b) *righteous* (as they presum’d to call  
them-

(a) *Ibid.* p. 39, 40. (b) *Sa. Gibson’s* serm. 24 Sept. 1645,  
p. 34. But because this prophane preacher has here also cast his  
odious reflections upon the solemn prayers which all the ortho-  
dox members of our church constantly put up for our lawful  
sovereign, I shall transcribe what the learned Dr. *Comber* says,  
in his commentary on the *collect for the King*. ‘ His friends are  
‘ our friends, and his enemies our enemies; for whoever attempts  
‘ to *smite the shepherd*, seeks to destroy the sheep, and is a mor-  
‘ tal foe to the whole nation. — If it be a foreign prince that  
‘ opposeth our King, he is a robber, and unjust, to invade his  
‘ neighbour’s rights: if he be a subject that riseth against his so-  
‘ veraign, he hath renounc’d christianity with his allegiance, and  
‘ is to be esteem’d a troubler of our *Israel*. Therefore, whoso-  
‘ ever they be that are *enemies to the King*, or whatsoever the  
‘ pre-

themselves!) whereas it was manifestly his rising up against his lawful sovereign; without any regard to *David's* personal righteousness, but only to God's authority, under which he was sacred and irresistible. But such preachers must be suppos'd to have forgot the *fifth commandment*; which containing an express promise of *long life* to those who *honour* their parents, whether natural, spiritual, or political, doth consequently imply a threatening, that those who do it not, (and much more then, those who actually rebel against them all, as the usurper here before us did,) shall be cut off short: and we can't believe, that the most zealous *Achitophels* would be content with such a revolution in their own families, to be insulted and turn'd out of doors by their own children and servants; and much less that they would own it to be *the Lord's doing*. 'Tis true, the great revolutions of government are attributed to a particular providence of God; who *is the judge, and putteth down one, and setteth up (a) another*. Yet still this 'doth not found any right of domination (as some fancied, till the argument from providence was return'd with greater force upon themselves:) but it shews, that when God pleases to make use of persons or nations as (b)

' scour-

' pretence be, we wish they may never prosper in that black impiety of unjust invasion or unchristian rebellion'. As I find him quoted, in *A vindic. of some among ourselves*, &c. 1692, p. 25

(a) *Psalm*. lxxv. 7. (b) 'Tis well observ'd, that God, 'to prevent the cavils of unreasonable men, has providentially laid open

## 144 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

' scourges in his hand, to punish a people with ;  
 ' he gives them success above their hopes or ex-  
 ' pectations ; but that success gives them no (a)  
 ' right. — And if God gives no right to him  
 ' whom he sets up, then it remains still in him  
 ' whom he has put down ; so that he is rightful  
 ' King still, though he is out of possession, and  
 ' the other is but an usurper that is in (b) pos-  
 ' session '.

And that the people's choice, consent or sub-  
 mission was another of *Abshalom's* pretended titles,  
 we may perceive by *Hushai's* mentioning that in  
 particular, as one of the reasons for his seeming  
 to come over to his interest ; saying, *Whom the*  
*Lord, and this people, and all the men of Israel,*  
*chuse, his will I be, and with him will I (c) abide ;*  
 which, by the way, is the first time that we hear  
 of that fallacious principle, *vox populi vox Dei!*  
*that the voice of the people is the voice of God!*  
 tho' here it was not made use of as a maxim,  
 but

' open his conduct in those most remarkable words, *Isa. x. 5.*  
 ' *O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in his hand (or*  
 ' *the power I have arm'd him with) is mine indignation: I will*  
 ' *send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people*  
 ' *of my wrath will I give him a charge to take the spoil. And*  
 ' then it follows, v. 7. *Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth*  
 ' *his heart think so, but it is in his heart to destroy, and cut off*  
 ' *nations not a few.* And we learn from the 12th verse, that  
 ' when the man had perform'd all this work, God would punish  
 ' him for what he had done'. Mr. D'Oyly's serm. at Bath, 17 Sept.  
 1710, p. 18, in 4to.

(a) *Stillingfl.* serm. 13 Nov. 1678, p. 17. (b) Bishop *Lloyd's*  
 disc. of God's ways of dispos. of Kingd. 1691, p. 56. (c)  
 2 Sam. xvi. 18.

but meerly as a colourable complement to the humour of the party : for *Hushai* was so far from being a revolter in his heart, that he was *David's* (a) companion, and remarkably *his friend* ; which made *Abfalom* at first admire at his supposed (b) desertion. But he was expresly authoriz'd, and commanded by King *David* himself, to make his court to the usurper in this manner, in order to defeat the counsel of *Achitophel*, and to give him notice of what (c) pass'd ; which he happily effected. How far such insincere professions may be justifiable in human policy, I shall not take upon me to determine. 'Tis plain, he went a great length in his compliance ; not only saluting *Abfalom* in the proper stile of soveraignty, *God save the King, God save the King!* but in such further terms as were understood as a promise of true allegiance : but then, as he did not presume to take the name of *God* in vain by any oath, and he had *David's* own authority for what he did, his case appears in a different light from that of those who scruple no terms of compliance with any other *Abfalom*, or *Oliver*, who hath power to reward them.

And yet, notwithstanding all these his pretended titles, grounded upon the King's abdication, the people's election, his own success, and full possession, and (what is still more) the providence, that all this happen'd according to what *the Lord* had foretold to *David* by the prophet *Nathan* ;

U

*Abfa-*

(a) 1 Chron. xxyii. 33.  
— xv. 33, &c.

(b) 2 Sam. xvi. 16, 17.

(c)



## 146 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

*Abſalom* was never the more their King, but a ſturdy rebel, and his enterprize, even when it was in its height, is by the Holy Ghoſt branded with the foul name of a (a) *conſpiracy*: and *Da-vid*, tho' out of poſſeſſion and in exile, is every where acknowledg'd to be their only lawful and rightful King (as I have ſhewn our (b) ſovereign was in a like caſe;) and as ſuch, in God's good time, happily reſtor'd to his repenting ſubjects.

David's re-  
ſtoration. § XXXVII. ' Now the men both  
' of *Judah* and *Iſrael*, they were all  
' convinced; they all very well knew, that the  
' ſeat of the kingdom was *David's*; knew *Ab-ſalom*  
' to have no title but what the ſword made  
' him; knew the right of the throne belong'd  
' to him who was fled, to him who was out of  
' the land: and therefore, if they would have  
' peace and government built upon the founda-  
' tion of righteouſneſs, they could not but con-  
' clude, the King himſelf muſt have his right;  
' he who was unjuſtly baniſht, muſt in righteouſ-  
' neſs be call'd (c) home', &c. And yet none of  
theſe conſiderations would weigh with them, till  
after they had taſted of the calamities of war,  
and felt the ſmart of arbitrary government under  
a prevailing faction: but when they found them-  
ſelves actually ſubject to that tyranny, under an  
uſurper, which they were only afraid of under their  
King, then they became ſenſible of their folly and  
madneſs, in having made ſo fatal a revolution;  
and

(a) 2 *Sam.* xv. 12.  
6 *Apr.* 1660, p. 38.

(b) Page 50.

(c) *Allington's* ſerm.

and therefore after a bloody battle, and the death of the usurper, they bethought themselves, that it was their true interest, as well as their duty, to call home *David* again, rather than presume to set up another *Absalom*, and be consequently forc'd to keep an army on foot to support him in his usurpation. For (as 'tis well express'd by a divine before quoted,) ' a King, it seems, is one  
' of those good things, whose want doth best  
' commend them: for whilst *David* was at home,  
' and in the city, the citizens would not strengthen  
' his hands, would not stand to him, for he was  
' fain to fly; but now, when out of the land,  
' then they begin to consider the feeling and sensible distance between an usurper and a father,  
' between an *Absalom* and a *David*. And then  
' they find there was as much difference between  
' the King and his usurper, as is between an  
' husband and an adulterer: for as the one takes  
' a woman for his love, and the other for his lust,  
' even so do they take crowns, the King to promote, the usurper to make a prey on it; the  
' King he loves, the usurper he lusts; the King  
' studieth the advance, peace and improvement  
' of his people —, but the usurper he studieth  
' how to advance himself, how to build up his  
' house (a) &c. Thus God, who alone is able to bow the hearts of men, and to *turn them whithersoever* (b) it pleases him, having providentially influenc'd these revolvers, they, as it were with

U 2

one

(a) *Allingt. serm.* 6 Apr. 1660, p. 33.

(b) *Prov.* xxi. 1.

## 148 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

one heart, *sent this word unto the King, Return thou and all thy* (a) *servants*; and contended fiercely among themselves, which of them should be *the first in bringing him* (b) *back!* which manifests the truth of that proposition, that 'just authority, however depress'd for a season, usually recovers and gets up again, and ' unjust usurpation, however high and successful ' for a while, seldom holds out long against a ' righteous (c) title'. And the reason thereof seems very convincing. For 'while any man ' holds and claims only by unrighteousness, he ' doth not hold of God, nor doth God look up- ' on the thing he holds, as his, till some way of ' right makes it so: whilst he holds it by wrong, ' he rates him not as the owner, but usurper, ' and therefore bids him restore the right owner ' his own again; and that is all any man ever ' gets with him by meer unrighteous possession; ' viz. no property therein, but only guilt and ' punishment, and a necessity of making restitu- ' tion (d)!'. And this reasoning holds good, more especially with relation to *kingdoms and na- tions*, which 'are therefore either rewarded or pu- nish'd in this world, because they shall not, as ' such, be judg'd in the other: and the same ' may be said of their rulers too. When the great- ' est monarch goes down into the grave, all his ' pomp and power, his titles and majesty perish ' toge-

(a) 2 Sam xix. 14. (b) — vers. 9, and 43. (c) Forā's  
serm. 28 June, 1660, p. 7. (d) Kestlewell's works, vol. 2.  
fol. 213. See also Beveridge's serm. of restitution.

‘ together with him ; and he shall stand in judg-  
 ‘ ment in the same undistinguish’d rank with the  
 ‘ meanest of his subjects : whatsoever reward  
 ‘ therefore God shall please to give to such a  
 ‘ one, as a King, it must be all in this present  
 ‘ (a) life’.

But before I leave this remarkable case, I cannot but stop to compare the modesty of this King *de facto*, *Absalom*, with the unwarrantable assurance of our *English* protector, *Oliver* ; where I can’t find the least footstep of any oath, covenant or engagement to *Absalom*, much less any abjuration of the titles and pretensions of *David*, the King *de jure*, tho’ he was then in exile, and thereby divested of the exercise of his sovereign authority. And therefore not finding any thing of that here (in which our late *English* usurpers so far outwent those *Jews*,) I shall not presume to determine, whether in case such oaths, or covenants, or engagements had been requir’d in *Absalom*’s case, the people of *Israel* (b) could with a good conscience have taken them ; nor whether, if they had, by whatever inducements, been prevail’d withal to take them, such oaths, or covenants, or engagements had oblig’d them to any thing but repentance and restitution ; nor whether such people had been bound in conscience, upon the  
 the

(a) *Wake’s* serm. 26 Nov. 1691, p. 19. (b) A zealous modern is very positive, that ‘ no ecclesiastical wash can hide the  
 ‘ crime of abjuring the person, whom I believe my sovereign,  
 ‘ and professing allegiance to another whom I think an usurper’.  
 ‘ *Tho. Bradbury’s* serm. 5 Nov. 1715, p. 26.



## 150 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

the first conviction of their illegality, to have reversed and disclaim'd them; nor particularly, whether *Joab*, who (a) *thrust three darts through the heart of Absalom*, the usurper, had been guilty of treason; nor whether he could have justified himself in so doing, by virtue of his natural allegiance to *David*, the King *de jure*. These, I say, are questions, that, not being resolv'd in the case before me, I shall not presume to determine; but refer them to be discuss'd at leisure, by the help of the several eminent authorities here (b) quoted, whilst I proceed in my history. However, with respect to that other case, to which this is applicable, in our *English* history, I must observe, that the representative body of the nation, in a free parliament assembled, declar'd those oaths, covenants, and engagements which were impos'd upon the subjects, as well as all other the acts and ordinances made, during the late grand usurpation, to have been 'unlawful, and impos'd against the fundamental laws and liberties of this kingdom; to have had in themselves not the least colour of law or justice to support them; and (therefore) to have been null and void to all intents and purposes (c) whatsoever'.

*Sheba's revolt,  
and his sudden  
fall.*

§ XXXVIII. *ABSALOM* being sent to his Place, and the men of *Israel* being discontented, that those  
of

(a) 2 Sam. xviii. 14. (b) See Bishop Hall's propositions; Sanderfon's cases of oaths; The whole duty of man; Wake's discourse of swearing; and other casuists. (c) Stat. xiii. Car. 2. c. 1.

of *Judab* had been more active in the King's restoration than themselves, *every man of Israel went up from after David, and follow'd Sheba; who embrac'd that occasion to usurp the ten tribes (a) himself. He blew a trumpet, and said, We have no part in David, neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse; every man to his tents, O Israel!* as if he had plainly profess'd, in behalf of himself and his party, that 'unless they might have  
' the crown land, they were rather for a war than  
' a settlement, rather for confusion than a King;  
' they valued a King at no more than was their  
' own interest and their own (b) advantage'. But, he soon met with his reward, being pursu'd to death by certain loyal (c) subjects: and then all the people return'd again to their true allegiance. In which case it is observable, that tho' this usurper had also all the tribes of *Israel*, while *David* had but the loyal tribe of *Judab* with him, he was never once termed a King, but a *man of Belial*; which, (as a learned prelate observes)  
' in effect is as much as if it had been said, that  
' he was of his father the (d) devil'!

Here it may be proper to take notice of the spawn of old *Leviathan*, who would persuade us, that *dominion is founded in power*; and that *tho' the right of the sovereign is not entinguish'd by a prosperous invasion or rebellion, yet the obligation of the subjects is: so that, when our lawful King is not*  
*able*

(a) 2 Sam. xx. 1, 2. (b) Allington's serm. 29 June, 1660, p. 54. (c) 2 Sam. xx. 22. (d) Archbishop Usher of obedience of subj. p. 125.

able to protect us, we are at liberty to seek it any where; and are bound to defend him who has the possession, and power to protect us, so long as we are able. But all this may well be answer'd as a facetious and popular writer does it. 'It is true indeed (says he) what a right reverend preacher said, that *possession is eleven points of the law*: but where is the twelfth? we want the point of right; without which the eleven points of law are like the verdict of eleven jurymen, for receiving of which, King *Alfred* heretofore hanged one of his (a) judges. — Suppose any man, by forcible entry, gets possession of the mannor-house, is he thereupon Lord of the mannor, or has he a right to the rents of the tenants? it intitles him to nothing that I know of but to be follow'd by a writ of ejectment; for the right and the estate are for ever inseparable: for tho' the right owner be not in the estate, yet the estate is always in (b) him'. However this is plain, from the case here in our view, that 'the publick peace being once broken, it is impossible for them that begin a civil war, to stop where they will, or end it when they please, or even to judge what their own resolutions will be, as the state of things alters or advances: new men will graft upon the schemes and successes of the prime designers; and they that are once engaged, will gradually advance to the highest villanies, rather than quit

(a) *Sam. Johnson's* notes on the *phœnix* edition of the pastoral letter, 1564, p. 20. (b) *Ibid.* p. 25.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION. 153

‘quit the game, or suffer it to be played out of  
‘their (a) hands’.

§ XXXIX. As to *Solomon*, it is Solomon;  
granted that he was *King by a divine* a King by di-  
*right, in the strictest sense of the* vine right. *(b) word.*

For, tho’ he was a younger son of *David*, and consequently indeed could not be the next heir by birth, as himself acknowledg’d to his mother, concerning *Adonijah*, saying, *Ask for him the kingdom also; for he is mine elder (c) brother*, (where, by the way, we may observe, that *Solomon* himself, who did not use to speak improperly, affirms, that, by the ordinary right and course of succession, the Kingdom was to have gone according to the natural law of primogeniture;) yet, as he was the person who was, expressly and by name, promis’d to be establish’d in the throne, by the Lord, even before his (d) birth; of which *David* was also put in mind (e) afterwards: therefore (and for that reason only) it was, that *Solomon* was immediately set upon the throne, by *David*’s order, according to the word of the (f) Lord.

This is further manifested both by *David* and *Solomon* himself. For *David*, instructing *Solomon* in God’s promises, and his duty, tells him, *The word of the Lord came to me, saying, A son shall be born to thee, — his name shall be Solomon; — and I will establish the throne of his kingdom over*

X

Israel

(a) Dr. *Chandl.* serm. 7 *June*, 1716, p. 23. (b) *J. Archer’s* serm. at *Tunbr.* 8 *Aug.* 1714, p. 27. (c) 1 *Kin.* ii. 22.  
(d) 2 *Sam.* vii. 12. (e) 1 *Kin.* i. 11, &c. (f) — 32, &c.



# 154 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

Israel for (a) ever: and in a set speech, wherein he declar'd both his own and Solomon's divine right, he says, *The Lord God of Israel chose me before all the house of my father, to be King over Israel for ever — ; and of all my sons, he hath chosen Solomon, my son, to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the Lord over Israel ; and he said unto me, — I will establish his kingdom for (b) ever.* And again he saith, *Solomon my son, whom alone God hath (c) chosen, &c.* Thus Solomon also himself says, *The Lord hath perform'd his word that he spake, and I am risen up in the room of David my father, and sit on the throne of Israel, as the Lord (d) promised: and again Solomon said unto God, Thou hast shewed great mercy unto David my father, and hast made me to reign in his (e) stead.* In full conviction whereof, and to put his title out of all doubt, *all the Princes, and the mighty men, and all the sons likewise of King David, submitted themselves unto Solomon the (f) King.*

'Tis true, *Adonijah* (his eldest surviving brother) at first made a party, to secure his natural right of succession. And such was the universal respect to the law of primogeniture, that *all Israel set their faces on him, that he should (g) reign:* but he soon was convinc'd, and acknowledg'd, that *the kingdom was his brother Solomon's from the (h) Lord ; who alone has the power and prerogative*

(a) 1 Chron. xxii. 8, &c. (b) ——— xxviii. 4, &c. (c) ——— xxix. 1. (d) 1 Kin. viii. 20. (e) 2 Chron. i. 8. (f) 1 Chron. xxix. 24. (g) 1 Kin. ii. 15. (h) Ibid.

rogative to dispense with, and supersede his own laws, and those of nature.

Here, tho' the case is plain enough in itself, yet I find it necessary to add a remark, with respect to the insinuation of Mr. *Whiston*. He admits, that *Adonijah* was the *eldest son then (a)* alive, but insinuates, that nevertheless, *Adonijah* himself 'does not yet deny, that the consent of 'the people was also requisite in such a case; 'and that when God turned the hearts of the 'people to recognize *Solomon*, that recognition 'was a sufficient title to the throne, even in barr 'to that primogeniture itself (b)'. In answer to which, and to demonstrate the fallacy thereof, it is observable, that *Adonijah* affirms (and appeals even to *Solomon's* mother for the truth of it) that the right of succession was his: *Thou knowest (says he) that the kingdom was mine* (meaning by the natural right of primogeniture:) as if he had said, according to *Peter Martyr*, *This is so notorious and manifest, that it is impossible you should be ignorant of (c) it*; for (as *Adonijah* proceeds so fully sensible was every body of that my inherent right, by virtue of the laws of God and nature (which also they knew, to be absolutely indefeasible (d), without the manifest and apparent interposition of God himself, and that too, not by doubtful events, which some affect to call the *appearance of God by his providence*; but by an express and clear revelation of his di-

X 2

vine

(a) Script. polit. p. 29. (b) *Ibid.* p. 30. (c) *P. Mart.*  
in loco. (d) *Deut.* xxi. 15, &c.

vine will, for that purpose,) that they, even *all* Israel, *set their faces on me, that I should reign, as,* being their King's eldest son : but when it appear'd, beyond all doubt, by such publick revelation, to be the will of God to alter the entail, then (and not before they acknowledg'd the *kingdom to be turned about to Solomon, because it was his from the Lord:* and as *Adonijah* himself (being likewise made sensible of God's exercising his peculiar prerogative in that case) readily submitted, and waved his claim to the crown, there was, from that time, no other pretender in view, and consequently no colour for any one to scruple the recognition of *Solomon*, whom God himself had so unquestionably appointed, and even nam'd to be their King, as before is demonstrated.

Nevertheless, so far was that recognition from being a sufficient (or indeed any) *title to the crown*, much less a *barr to the primogeniture* (as that learned *scripture-politician* pretends) that the very word *recognition* necessarily supposes a prior right inherent in the person recogniz'd, and implies an acknowledgment of that prior right, not the giving of a new one : besides, I *appeal to the consciences and common sense* of all mankind, whether any thing can be found more clear in the whole *bible* than this, that the people look'd upon it as their indispensable duty, to recognize the right of the eldest son, according to the known laws ; till being made thoroughly sensible, that God had openly dispens'd with his own laws (in that particular case) and declar'd himself in favour of  
*Solomon;*

## *the* REGAL SUCCESSION. 157

*Solomon* by name, and that, to make it the more notorious to them, *Adonijah* himself had also wav'd his pretension to the crown; the people, then having no room left to dispute the title, readily recogniz'd him whom *the Lord* had so expressly nominated, and to whom *Adonijah* himself had as expressly submitted.

It did not therefore require any great depth of judgment to observe from this case, that *hereditary right has been interrupted*, and that, 'notwithstanding such an interruption, yet the estate of the people of *Israel* was very happy under *Solomon's* (a) government'! for, when God Almighty did thus expressly interpose to chuse a King for them, and they had not provok'd him by any rebellious acts at that time, to *give them a King in his* (b) *anger*, 'tis no wonder that the people should be as happy under such a King, as under one of their own chusing; nay, I believe, it would puzzle this learned author to find out any one instance (at least in the scripture-history,) of their ever having been happy under any King of their own chusing: and whereas he observes, that 'after Kings have been anointed with oil, their persons have been always accounted sacred, and reckon'd to be God's vicegerents, and the supreme heads of the' (c) *people*', a little more reading (d) would have taught him, that the royal unction is but a ceremony, which, like that of coronation, is no part of the title; and that

many

(a) *T. Page's* serm. 20 *Jan.* 1714, p. 2, 3. (b) *Hof.* xlii. 11. (c) *T. Page*, as before. (d) See p. 45, and 72.



many Kings were never anointed, who, never the less for that, were as sacred, and as truly God's vicegerents, as those who were.

But, after the best inquiry I can make into the case before us, I can't discover the least colour of scripture, to warrant Mr. *Whiston's* observation, that God, in this preference of *Solomon*, had respect to his *personal virtue, goodness, and (a) desert*. He ventures indeed, tho' without authority, to call *Solomon* the *better son*, and *Adonijah* the *(b) worse*: but he will have much ado to prove that, especially at the time when God reveal'd his resolution to establish *Solomon* in the throne; unless, as he did in the case of *Esau* and *Jacob*, he will pretend to distinguish the better from the worse, before they were born, or were capable of *doing either good or (c) evil*; which, with submission, does not become him to judge of. I suppose, he does not think *Solomon* was so *preferr'd on account of his chastity*, as he says *Joseph (d) was!* and much less can we imagine it, on the account of his idolatry, tho' that was foreseen by God Almighty, even when he entail'd the crown upon him.

However, we may see the necessity of those speeches which *David* and *Solomon* made in maintenance of their divine right; that the people might perceive, by apparent proofs, that the fundamental laws of nature were not alter'd by them, without the express revelation and appointment

(a) Script polit. p. 12, 13.  
ix. 11. (d) See p. 40, 41.

(b) *Ibid.* p. 29.

(c) *Gen.*

## *the* REGAL SUCCESSION. 159

ment of the Lord; which alone supercedes all other legal qualifications whatsoever. Upon which account (and no other) *Adonijah*, and all who had help'd him to exalt himself against the Lord's exprefs ordinance, were guilty of usurpation and treason, and thereby forfeited their liberties, estates and lives, as well as their employments, to *Solomon's* mercy.

And as *Adonijah* himself had a pardon, or a reprieve only, upon condition of future good (a) behaviour, (and therefore lost his life afterwards, as soon as the King judged the condition broken;) so *Abiathar* his life was spared by King *Solomon*, for his former good services to King *David*, but the priesthood is said to have been taken from him, and restored to *Zadok*, *that he might fulfil the word of the Lord, which he spake concerning the house of Eli in* (b) *Shiloh*; of which I shall treat more particularly by and by.

§ XL. IN the mean time, I must take notice, how manifestly King *Solomon* himself violated the law which God had given for the rule of the King's conduct, as before (c) is intimated. God's law was exprefs, *that he shall not multiply And irrefor-  
horses to himself — ; neither shall he stable.  
multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not  
away; neither shall he greatly multiply to himself  
silver and* (d) *gold*: and yet *Solomon* did multiply horses to a very great (e) number, and had them  
fetcht

(a) 1 Kings i. 52. — ii. 23, &c. (b) 1 Sam. ii. 35. & Kin. ii. 27. (c) P. 109. (d) Dent. xvii. 16, 17. (e) 1 Kings iv.

## 160 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

*fetcht up and brought forth out of* (a) *Egypt, contrary to the same law: he multiply'd wives also, to the prodigious number of seven hundred that were princeesses, and three hundred* (b) *concubines; many of which too were strange women, of the nations which they were absolutely* (c) *forbid to inter-marry with: he likewise multiply'd silver and gold, insomuch that he exceeded all the Kings of the earth for* (d) *riches: and moreover, in his old age, his strange wives turn'd away his heart after other* (e) *Gods. So that the people might very plausibly have been told, that 'they were a free*  
 ' *people; that Solomon invaded their liberties and*  
 ' *privileges; that therefore they did but them-*  
 ' *selves justice, if they took the cause into their*  
 ' *own hands, and righted themselves; that their*  
 ' *King was a favourer of idolatry; that they*  
 ' *were God's people, and therefore ought to se-*  
 ' *cure God's rights as well as their own, and not*  
 ' *suffer any innovation to be made in religion;*  
 ' *that their taking up arms therefore would not*  
 ' *be*

iv. 26. It is said, that he *had forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen.* But this is, by good interpreters, thought to be *a fault crept into the original by the negligence of transcribers;* and the rather, because 2 Chron. ix. 25. it is only said, that Solomon had *four thousand stalls for horses and chariots:* which indeed is the more probable, because we find, 1 Kin. x. 26. and 2 Chron. i. 14. that he had *no more than one thousand and four hundred chariots;* and the chariots of war did not commonly consist of more than two horses.

(a) 1 King's x. 28, and 2 Chron. i. 16, 17. — ix. 28. (b)  
 1 Kings xi. 3. (c) — vers. 1, 2. Exod. xxxiv. 16. (d)  
 — x. 23. (e) 1 Kings xi. 4.

‘ be rebellion — ; that their King, and those that  
 ‘ adher’d to him, had fallen off from God, and  
 ‘ therefore had forfeited all their propriety in the  
 ‘ government and the (a) land’, &c. according  
 to the doctrine of the late times here expos’d.  
 And yet, for all this his idolatry, and other trans-  
 gressions of the known law, tho’ God (who was  
 his only proper judge) was highly provok’d, and  
 threatned to *rend the kingdom from* (b) *him*, there  
 is not the least suggestion, that there was a justi-  
 fiable occasion for his subjects to rebel and set  
 up another King ; because ‘ he was accountable  
 ‘ to no earthly (c) tribunal’.

§ XLI. AND now I shall endeavour *The case*  
 to set forth a fair state of the case of *of Solomon*  
*Solomon and Abiathar*, because I find *and Abia-*  
*thar stated.*  
 great advantage taken therefrom, by certain  
*Erastian* writers ; among whom it is become a  
 standing argument for the suppos’d right of the  
 civil magistrate, to deprive bishops, and other ec-  
 clesiastical persons, from their ecclesiastical func-  
 tions, or at least from the exercise thereof, upon  
 mere civil or state crimes : as if they were in-  
 deed *no other than* (what a presbyterian author  
 would make the *priests of old* to have been) the  
 ‘ menial or household servants of the King — to  
 ‘ order things appertaining to the King’s table  
 ‘ and service ; and over all these the high-priest,

Y

‘ as

(a) *Wagst. ferm.* 9 Sept. 1683. p. 4, 5.  
 (c) *Sherl. of resist.* p. 39.

(b) 1 Kings xi. 11.



‘ as lord high-steward and lord high chamber-  
 ‘ lain (a) ’!

Thus an eminent prelate, here frequently quoted, calls this ‘ so plain and so unexceptionable  
 ‘ an instance against the *adversaries of lay-depriva-*  
 ‘ *tions*, in this very point of deprivation, that,  
 ‘ he thinks, their own answers shew the impossi-  
 ‘ bility of geting clear of (b) it’. And to put  
 the better colour upon his argument, he makes  
 bold with the work of God, and affirms that ‘ So-  
 ‘ *lomon* depriv’d one of the exercise of his func-  
 ‘ tion, to which he had been appointed according  
 ‘ to the institution of God himself, and the same  
 ‘ *Solomon* appointed another to succeed (c) him’.  
 And upon this he flourishes, after his manner,  
 and triumphantly demands, ‘ what can be a more  
 ‘ expresse parallel than this, of the supreme civil  
 ‘ power depriving one ecclesiastical person, and  
 ‘ putting in another, upon the sole consideration  
 ‘ of the interest of the (d) state ’? Now, as it is  
 not my business here to follow him out of my own  
 road, I shall not pursue him through his several  
 turns of reasoning upon it, but stick close to the  
 facts, as I have them warranted by the holy scrip-  
 tures: and the rather because I find the late reve-  
 rend Dr. *Nat. Marshall* affirming, that ‘ what is  
 ‘ suggested of *Solomon*’s restoring *Zadok*, who  
 ‘ was the rightful high-priest, as being of the elder  
 ‘ family, is a precarious, unsupported assertion,  
 ‘ in

(a) *Fleming*’s hist. of hered. right, 1717, p. 19. (b) B. *Ban-*  
*gor*’s preserv. against the *Nonjur.* p. 43, edit. 4, 1717. (c) *Ibid.*  
 (d) *Ibid.*

‘invented meerly for a salvo to an *hypothesis*  
‘which must sink without it, contrary to the  
‘tenour of the (a) history!’ &c. But, tho’ I will  
not be so bold to say (as Mr. *Whiston* does,) that  
these writers ‘treat upon this subject of govern-  
‘ment, both ecclesiastical and civil, as if there  
‘were hardly any such book as the bible among  
‘(b) us’! yet I presume to think, there is enough  
to be collected from the tenour of the history  
to manifest, that this instance is nothing to the  
purpose for which it is so frequently cited.

For in those sacred records we have plain proof,  
that, after the death of *Nadab* and (c) *Abihu* (the  
two eldest sons of *Aaron*,) the survivors were  
*Eleazar* and (d) *Itamar*, who minister’d in the  
priests office in the sight of *Aaron* their (e) father;  
*Eleazar* being the chief over the chief of the (f) *Le-*  
*vites*: that, upon the death of *Aaron*, *Eleazar*,  
as the eldest son, immediately succeeded him in  
the office of high-priest (which was hereditary,)  
and was solemnly invested as such by *Moses*, as  
the Lord (g) commanded: that upon the death of  
*Eleazar*, his son (h) *Phinehas* succeeded in the same;  
unto whom, and his seed, was given the covenant  
of an everlasting (i) priesthood, or (as it is in other  
interpreters) the priest’s office for ever by a covenant.

Y 2

for

(a) *N. Marsh.* def. of constit. 1717, p. 41. (b) *Whist.* script.  
polit. dedicat. to *B. Bangor*, 1717, p. xviii. (c) *Levit.* x. 1, 2.  
*Numb.* iii. 4. — xxvi. 61, and 1 *Chron.* xxiv. 2. (d) *Exod.*  
vi. 23. — xxviii. 1 *Chron.* vi. 3. — xxiv. 1. (e) *Numb.* iii.  
4. (f) — vers. 32. (g) — xx. 28. (h) *Judg.* xx.  
28. (i) *Numb.* xxv. 13.

# 164 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

for (as the son of *Sirach* expresses it,) *there was a covenant of peace made with him, — that he and his posterity should have the dignity of the priesthood for (a) ever*: that accordingly we have the line of the high-priests from *Aaron*, through *Eleazar*, *Phinebas*, &c. in a direct hereditary descent, down to the (b) captivity: that in this sacerdotal line or pedigree, we find *Zadok* expressly register'd as high-priest; but not one of the race of *Ithamar* nam'd therein. All which proves from the tenour of the history (written by divine inspiration) that *Zadok* had the only natural and proper inherent right to the high-priesthood, and did not owe it to any human appointment, as these Gentlemen insinuate.

'Tis true indeed, that, about the time of the *Judges*, the house of *Ithamar* seems to have encroach'd upon that of *Eleazar*, and to have taken the advantage of those licentious times, to extend their jurisdiction beyond their proper bounds. For *Eli* the priest, who descended from *Ithamar*, is said to have *judged Israel forty (c) years*: and his house enjoy'd such state and power afterwards, 'as only could regularly be claim'd by the true high-priest of the family of *Eleazar*; so that they have commonly pass'd for the sole high-priests of that nation for some (d) time'. Thus we read of *Abia*, the son of *Abitub*, the son of *Phinebas*, the son of *Eli*, the Lord's priest in *Shiloh*,

(a) *Eccly* xlv. 24.

(b) 1 *Chron.* vi. 3, &c. *Ezra* vii. 1, &c.

(c) 1 *Sam.* iv. 18.

(d) *Whist.* script. pol. p. 99, 100.

(a) *Shiloh*; and of *Abimelech*, the son of *Abitub*, at (b) *Nob*; who was massacred by *Saul*, with all his house, except only his son *Abiatbar*, of whom we are here treating. But whatever state any of these might have taken upon themselves, 'tis certain, that not one of them being register'd by the Holy Ghost in the line or pedigree of the high-priests, we ought not to reckon them lawful and rightful high-priests, as we do *Zadok* and the rest of the elder family of *Eleazar*. So that, even supposing *Abiatbar* had, *de facto*, been in the sole possession of the high-priesthood, and had indeed been depriv'd of it by *Solomon*, (both which the advocates for lay-deprivations take for granted,) yet, since 'tis plain, that he had no right to it, according to its divine institution, with what propriety can it be said, that *Solomon* depriv'd one of the exercise of his function, *to which he had been appointed according to the institution of God himself?* or what advantage would it be to their scheme, to grant (for argument sake only,) that *Solomon* had actually depriv'd one who plainly had no right, to make way for him who had the only proper right to it? 'Tis not necessary to insist, that *Solomon* was undeniably the lawful sovereign, and therefore, as such, did not want sufficient authority to do any act, that was not unjust

(a) 1 *Sam.* xiv. 3. 'Tis well observ'd by Mr. *Selden* (tom. ii. col. 93.) that these words, *the Lord's priest in Shiloh*, must refer to *Eli*, not to *Abia*, because *God had*, before *Abia's* time, *forsaken the tabernacle of Shiloh*. *Psa.* lxxviii. 60, and 1 *Sam.* iv. 11.

(b) — xxi, and xxii.



just in itself, even upon the sole consideration of the interest of the state: for (with submission, I should think) not only the supreme civil power, but any person whatsoever who is able, might be well warranted in the use of all lawful means, in order to the dispossessing an unjust invader of another's property, and the imitating that divine character of helping them to right that suffer (a) wrong.

But, if we examine this case still further, we shall find, that when *Eli* was in the height of his state, and his sons (those sons (b) of Belial!) were making themselves (c) fat (as unjust possessors are apt to do,) with the spoils of God's people, inasmuch that, by their unrestrain'd licentiousness, they were not only become personally scandalous, but are said to have made the Lord's people to transgress, and even to abhor the offering of the (d) Lord, there came a man of God unto (e) *Eli*, denouncing terrible judgments against his house, and among the rest, that his posterity should be reduc'd to a low station and great distress, whilst a faithful priest should be rais'd up, who should walk before the Lord's anointed for ever; all which was soon after confirm'd to him by the prophet (f) *Samuel*. And in pursuance of this account, we read, that when King *David* had brought the ark of God to Jerusalem, to set it in the tabernacle that he had pitch'd for (g) it, *Zadok and Abiathar were the priests*

(a) *Psa.* cxlvi. 6. old transl. (b) *1 Sam.* ii. 12. (c) — vers. 29. (d) — vers. 24, and 17. (e) — vers. 27, &c. (f) — iii. 11, &c. (g) *2 Sam.* vi. 17. and *1 Chron.* xv. 1, &c.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION 167

(a) *priests* who had the principal charge of it : and in the division, which he made of the sons of *Aaron*, into four and twenty orders, or courses, according to the number of the chief men among the sons of *Eleazar*, there were sixteen chief men of the house of their fathers, and eight among the sons of *Ithamar*, according to the house of their (b) fathers : and *David* distributed them, both *Zadok* of the sons of *Eleazar*, and (c) *Ahimelech* of the sons of *Ithamar*, according to their offices in their (d) service ; by which we may learn, that *Zadok* at least was over the sixteen, and *Abimelech* at most but over the eight. Thus we see the house of *Ithamar*, *Eli*, or *Abiathar* (for it is all the same) was already, in *David's* time, but half so considerable as that of *Eleazar* : and since, 'tis certain, there was one high-priest, properly so call'd, over all, we can't doubt but *Zadok* had a primacy, or metropolitical jurisdiction (as we call it) over all the *Jews* in general, and whatever particular jurisdiction *Abiathar* had over his own division, it must have been still subordinate to

(a) 1 Chron. xv. 11. (b) 1 Chron. xxiv. 4. (c)

Here the reader is to be advertis'd (from the learned *Selden*, de successione in pontificat. *Ebraorum*, tom. ii. col. 94.) that *Abiathar* is sometimes call'd *Abimelech* or *Abimelech*, as his father *Abimelech* is also sometimes call'd *Abiathar* ; particularly in *St. Mark* ii. 26. which being compar'd with 1 Sam. xxi, and xxii, will discover the truth of this observation to the meanest capacity. And this will also shew, that where we read *Abimelech*, the son of *Abiathar*, 2 Sam. viii. 17, and 1 Chron. xviii. 16. it should be *Abiathar*, the son of *Abimelech*. But this I leave to the Criticks.

d) 1 Chron. xxiv. 3.

to *Zadok*. And moreover we always find *Zadok*, as the superior, plac'd before *Abiathar* (or *Abimelech*,) wherever they are mention'd (a) together, as well in *David's* time, as in that of *Solomon*: yea, *Zadok* alone is call'd *the ruler of the house of* (b) *God*; and *the ruler of the* (c) *Aaronites*, even before *Abiathar's* treason, as *Phinebas*, the son of *Eleazar*, is call'd *the ruler over them in time* (d) *past*, (who was, without dispute, the only proper high-priest in his time;) and *Zadok* alone was *anointed to be* (e) *priest*, that is, the chief, or supreme high-priest, when *Solomon* was anointed King, in the life time of his father *David*, tho' *Abiathar* was, after that, still reckon'd a (f) *priest*, in the same rank as he was before, to wit, in subordination to the only true high-priest *Zadok*. So far was *Abiathar* from being the proper high-priest of the *Jews*, even in *David's* time; and so far is it from being true, that he was *depriv'd*, and *Zadok* put into it by *Solomon*, as successor to him in that high office, that *Zadok* was always before

(a) 2 *Sam.* viii. 17. — xv. 35. — xx. 25. 1 *Kings* iv. 4. 1 *Chron.* xv. 11. — xviii. 16. — xxiv. 3, 6, 31. Where it is to be noted, that their being thus frequently nam'd together, is no proof that they were equally high-priests: for we read of their ancestors, 1 *Chron.* xxiv. 2. that *Eleazar* and *Ithamar* executed the priest's office; and yet 'tis evident, *Numb.* xx. 28. that *Eleazar* alone was the high-priest, and not *Ithamar*, as before is set forth, p. 163. (b) 1 *Chron.* ix. 11. (c) — xxvii. 17. *Zadok* could not properly have been call'd so, if he had not been ruler over the posterity of *Ithamar* as well as of *Eleazar*, who were equally *Aaronites*. (d) 1 *Chron.* ix. 20. (e) — xxix. 22. (f) 1 *Kings* iv. 4.

fore him, always above him. And therefore we need not here to enter into the question, whether *David* 'should have suffer'd the whole *Jewish* ' church to continue in a state of schism, by a ' detention of *Zadok* from his (a) right! since 'tis plain, that good King indeed ' was a man so much ' after God's own (b) heart', and so far from a forcible detention of God's high-priest from his right, that he restor'd him to it, and thereby took care to heal that schism in which the whole Jewish church may more properly be said to have continued, from the time of *Eli*, while the line of *Itbamar* was suffer'd to enjoy that high and holy office, instead of the elder line of *Eleazar*, on which God himself had expressly entail'd the high-priesthood, as before is fully prov'd.

And as we find *Abiathar*, even at *Solomon's* accession to the throne, not the high-priest, but in a state of subordination; let us now examine the full import of that text (upon which so great a stress is laid,) where *Solomon* is said to have thrust him out from being priest unto the (c) Lord, &c.

It has been already (d) intimated, that upon *Adonijah's* attempt upon his father's crown, he conferr'd (or concerted measures) with *Joab* and *Abiathar*, and they following *Adonijah*, helped (e) him; and that their lives, and all they had besides, were thereby at the King's mercy: and therefore, whatever station *Abiathar* had been

Z

in,

(a) *N. Marsh.* def. of constit. p. 41, 42. (b) *Ibid.* (c) 1 *Kings* ii. 27. (d) *Pag.* 159. (e) 1 *Kings* i. 7.



in, so soon as he was convicted of so foul a crime as high-treason, upon manifest overt-acts, it could not but be deem'd a favour shewn him by his lawful soveraign, to spare his forfeited life, tho' it had really been on condition of his losing all the rest. But instead of this, *Unto Abiathar the priest said the King, Get thee to Anathoth, unto thine own fields, for thou art worthy of death: but I will not at this time put thee to death, because thou (a) barest the ark of the Lord God before David my father, and because thou hast been afflicted in all wherein my father was afflicted. So Solomon thrust out Abiathar, from being priest unto the Lord: that he might fulfill the word of the Lord, which he spake concerning the house of Eli in (b) Shiloh; — and Zadok the priest did the King put in the room of (c) Abiathar.*

Now, that this was not intended as a deprivation, is plain from the very words of the sentence, which confin'd him to *his own fields* at *Anathoth*: for he had no fields of his own there, but what belonged to him as (d) priest; and therefore if he had been truly depriv'd of the priesthood, (as is alledg'd,) the estate annex'd to it had been no longer his own. As if (for instance in a modern case,) the sentence against a bishop of *Rochester* (e) had been, in the like terms, *Get thee to Bromley*

(a) Meaning, that he had assisted *Zadok* in bringing up the ark to *Jerusalem*. (b) 1 *Kings* ii. 26, 27. (c) — ver. 35. (d) *Josh.* xxi. 18. (e) See this point farther illustrated, in the notes upon the late edition of *Fran. Mason's vindic. of the church of England*, fol. 222.

Bromley unto thine own house, &c. I presume, nobody would have construed that as a deprivation of the see of *Rockester*, (since *Bromley* belongs to the bishop of that see only as bishop of it;) but as a punishment meerly secular, to confine him to his own house there, and consequently to disable him, for the time, to hold his seat in parliament, or to exercise his other office in person at *Westminster*, of which he was also Dean. And thus *Abiathar*, being confin'd to *Anatboth*, was thereby consequently disabled to officiate in his course at the *tabernacle* at *Jerusalem*; but not otherwise in the least affected as to his sacerdotal character; which he still retain'd nevertheless, as I have already shewn: so that if ever it had pleas'd the King to relax such sentence, and to give him a free pardon instead of this bare reprieve, *Abiathar* had been capable of exercising his office, in as full and ample manner as ever before. But during his continuance under this confinement, which had the effect of a suspension upon him, as it disabled him to exercise his office himself, the eight families of the house of *Ithamar* were immediately under the jurisdiction of *Zadok*, as well as the other sixteen of the house of *Eleazar*; tho' not as successor to *Abiathar*, but as the supreme or metropolitan, over all the sons of *Aaron*. For as to that expression, that *the King* put *Zadok* in the room of *Abiathar*, it proves no more, than that he establish'd and confirm'd the high priest of the house of *Aaron* in his full right and proper station, according to the injunction

## 172 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

given him by *David* from the (a) *Lord*: where the courses of the priests, and all the work of the service of the house of the (b) *Lord* are join'd together, and alike commanded; and a strict charge is expressly given him, in relation to the whole oeconomy of the house of God, which 'tis plain, he could not alter! *And behold, (said David,) the courses of the priests and the Levites, even they shall be with thee for all the service of the house of (c) God*: and thus we read, that when *Solomon* had finish'd the temple, he appointed, according to the order of *David* his father, the courses of the priests to their service, — as the duty of every man required —; for so had *David*, the man of God, (d) commanded. But, if the kingly authority had extended to the actual depriving of the true priests, and putting others into their places, then *Solomon* might have put any other into the place of *Abiathar*, without regard to *Zadok*; which he does not seem to have had in his thoughts, nor do I know that any body has yet presum'd to say he had authority to do it.

After all this, I leave the unprejudic'd readers to judge, with what truth and sincerity it can be affirm'd, that *Solomon*, 'by his own authority, took away what he never gave, nay, what *Abiathar* had from God (e) himself'! by which must be meant his sacerdotal character, or spiritual relation to God's people committed to his care, if the

(a) 1 *Chron.* xxviii. 19. (b) ——— vers. 13. (c) ——— vers. 21. (d) 2 *Chron.* viii. 14. (e) *B. Bangor's preface* v. p. 45.

## *the* REGAL SUCCESSION. 173

the meaning of that author (*a*) may ever be (absolutely and properly) understood from his own words, and from the tenour of his discourse.

In short, if this single text must be press'd into the service, to prove the authority of Kings to deprive bishops and priests of their sacred function, it will as well prove their authority to degrade them of their holy orders; because it is said, *King Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being priest unto the Lord*: but that will prove too much, and consequently shall prove nothing at all; because no Kings do now pretend to such authority to degrade them. And if the difficulty be solv'd, by supposing, that *Solomon* had an extraordinary commission from the Lord to do what he did, it will render this case of no use at all to those who cite it as a precedent for our times; since there is no pretence of any other Kings succeeding him in such extraordinary commission to do the like. And therefore, upon the whole matter, this being but a particular fact, nakedly set forth, without any mention of the circumstances relating to the proceedings upon it, it seems to want that certainty that is requisite to the making it fit for a precedent.

I might

(*a*) The learned Dr. *Trapp* says of him thus; 'I desire to be inform'd, what we are to think of a writer, who expresses himself in such a manner, that no body can understand him? for not only Dr. *Snape*, and myself, but all the lower house of convocation, and every body else, as far as I can observe, have it seems been entirely ignorant of his meaning. And what sort of meaning must that be?' *Trapp's* P. S. to his serm. 19 May, 1717, p. 31, 32.



I might here appeal to the censure of a convocation, which has condemn'd it as a *great* (a) *error*, in any man to affirm, 'that the people ' had any lawful interest, at any time, — either ' to chuse their priests, or (they being appointed of God as is aforesaid) to deprive them of ' their places', &c. But because the judgment of a convocation may seem to be of little or no authority with some of the writers we have here had to deal with, I shall content myself with subjoining a few such testimonies as they can't fairly except against.

In one of their own celebrated performances before cited, I find the civil power, and the ecclesiastical or spiritual, expressly acknowledg'd to have 'two rights, as distinct as heaven and (b) 'earth'. And in another it is observ'd, that 'by orders a man receives from Christ, a command to execute a sacred office upon lawful 'occasions, and he himself covenants so to execute it: now, as he cannot be absolv'd from 'that covenant, but only by Christ with whom 'he covenanted; so neither can he be discharg'd 'from that command, but only by Christ who 'impos'd (c) it, — or persons authoriz'd by (d) 'Christ'; meaning bishops in their synods. And a third is more express, that 'the greater power 'doth not always imply the less: nor doth it follow,

(a) B'shop Overal's convoc. book, l. ii. c. xii. (b) Bishop Hoadly's preserv. against the *Nonjur.* 1717, edit. 4, p. 21. (c) Dr. G. Rye's treat. against the *Nonjur.* 1719, vol. 1. p. 32, 33. (d) *Ibid* vol. ii. p. 216.

low, because the state may keep a clergyman in close confinement, or even put him to death, from whence will accidentally follow an incapacity in him from administering the sacraments, &c. that therefore it may formally deprive him of the power to administer them, which he receiv'd from Christ. — Death will dissolve all relative obligations, and deprive a man of the privileges to which he may be entitled — : but yet, he who hath the power of putting a man to death, hath not the power otherwise to dissolve those obligations, or to deprive the party, whom he may put to death, of those privileges. A *Roman* Emperor had authority to have made any Apostle of Christ a close prisoner, or to have put him to death, upon a just occasion ; which would naturally have depriv'd him of his apostolical powers : but yet a *Roman* emperor had otherwise no authority to meddle with the apostolical commission ; nor would Christ have remitted the *wo*, which St. *Paul* apprehended to himself (*a*) if he preach'd not the *gospel*, whilst he had power and liberty to do so, tho' the civil magistrate had forbidden him. So that we see, there is a manifest fallacy in the argument, which would entail upon the state a depriving power, as the less, from the (confess'd) greater power of imprisoning, or of putting to death. Our state hath apparently disclaim'd the one, whilst it hath asserted the

(a) 1 Cor. ix. 16.

## 176 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

‘ the (a) other’. But Mr. *Whiston* is still more full to that point; who, having stated the case of *Solomon* and *Abiathar*, among those where persons use their power somewhat *out of their proper sphere*, concludes, ‘ Upon the whole, here is no civil deprivation of an ecclesiastical person, or secular entrenchment on the ecclesiastical authority, but a just execution of the divine decree, without any such deprivation or entrenchment at (b) all’. And, speaking of the *bishops* whom the state *depriv’d at the revolution*, he takes the freedom to reflect on all such deprivations, in these plain terms; ‘ Certainly, one would think it a somewhat natural consequence of the acknowledgment of the spiritual powers at the admission of a bishop, that he should not be degraded or *depriv’d*, either of the right, or of the exercise of the same, without some accusation and conviction before the church, or college of bishops, or metropolitan, whereto he belongs; which is still own’d to be the regular way in ordinary cases even at this day: and the contrary procedure of depriving bishops from the exercise of their spiritual power, by

‘ a

(a) *N. Marshall's* def. of constit. 1717, p. 20, 21. (b) *Whist.* script. pol. p. 103. (c) *Viz.* for the *pretended crime* (as he calls it) of refusing ‘ to take that oath to K. *William* and Q. *Mary*, of the lawfulness whereof, after the former oath to K. *James*, they were not satisfy’d: which deprivation, in my opinion, (*says he*) they had more justly deserv’d, had they, with such their persuasion, comply’d with that oath, contrary to the dictates of their own consciences’. *Ibid.* dedic. to B. *Bangor*, p. xii.

‘ a meer secular authority, for meer secular of-  
‘ fences, seems to me almost as absurd as the pre-  
‘ tended power of the bishop of *Rome* to deprive  
‘ secular princes of their secular power for ec-  
‘ clesiastical offences: and those that are sensible  
‘ of the great usurpation and wickedness of the  
‘ latter, ought never to give any encouragement  
‘ to it, by justifying the former procedure; espe-  
‘ cially while the state has many other easy and  
‘ unexceptionable ways of punishing seditious or  
‘ rebellious clergymen; and can therefore never  
‘ be under any great temptation to do what is  
‘ in itself so perfectly unjustifiable upon the foot  
‘ of scripture and Christianity. I say, perfectly  
‘ unjustifiable upon those foundations. For, as I  
‘ have shew’d in this essay, that the case of *Abi-*  
‘ *athar*, depriv’d by *Solomon*, which is the only  
‘ pretended scripture-example, was quite of ano-  
‘ ther nature, and done upon another foundation;  
‘ so is the old state of Christianity known to be  
‘ fully against such a practice: insomuch, that  
‘ the greatest vindicators of the state at the re-  
‘ formation and revolution, have not, I think,  
‘ been able to produce one single authority for  
‘ it; at least, not till such late centuries as are of  
‘ no value when unsupported by earlier (a) anti-  
‘ quity’.

I might here have added two modern authori-  
ties: I mean the disturbances in the church of  
*England*, as well as in that of *Scotland*, occasion’d

A 2

by

(a) *Whist. script. pol. ded. to B. Bangor, p. x, xi.*



## 178 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

by the lay-deprivation of Dr. *Burnet*, archbishop of *Glasgow*; and an address of the house of Lords, (in or about *March*, 1705, as I remember,) complaining of some such deprivations of the clergy in *Carolina*, as being *repugnant to the laws of this realm, and destructive to the constitution of the church of England*: but, as I have not the printed address now by me, to vouch my quotation of the latter, and the former is easily to be met with in the books here referr'd (a) to, I shall leave this point to the reader's judgment, upon what has been so largely related already. And I presume, I shall need no apology for having been the longer upon it, because it has afforded matter of great controversy, with respect to the rights of Kings, and the doctrine of the *independency of the church upon the state, as to its pure spiritual powers*: however, I hope, this shall no more be call'd a *popish* (b) *principle* (which is known to have been the doctrine of the primitive church, earlier than popery itself;) especially since it is thus openly countenanc'd by such zealous protestants, as have here vouch'd for it on this occasion. But now, to return to the history.

§ XLII. AFTER the death of *Rehoboam's hereditary* *Iomon*, the original law of hereditary rights. succession, according to proximity of blood, came to be exactly observ'd in the kingdom of *Judab*. For, in obedience thereto, *all Israel came to Shechem (to Rehoboam) to make;*

(or

(a) *Collier's eccles. hist.* vol. ii. fol. 895. and *Mason's vindic. of the church*, 1728, fol. 436. (b) *Sachev. trial*, fol. 113, &c.

(or more properly, to recognize) *him* (a) *King*, who was *Solomon's* son and undoubted heir. But here the ten rebellious tribes, under pretence of grievances in *Solomon's* reign, (as the revolutionists had before done in the reign of *David*) presume to remonstrate against them, and to insist upon terms with their lawful King (as if liberty and property were things that a King only could have no pretence to!) which he, thro' a judicial infatuation (for the punishment of the sins of *Solomon*, as had been (b) foretold by the Lord) answering impolitickly, gave occasion to those tribes to revolt; as will be shewn hereafter. However, the (c) loyal tribes of *Judah* and *Benjamin* (which, because their possessions were intermix'd, are sometimes reckon'd as one) continu'd to be faithful, and bear true allegiance to their King's son.

But nevertheless, lest their example should be of any use to the advocates for hereditary right, Mr. *Whiston* (whose byass is turn'd the other way) insinuates, that 'his father's favour, his mother's interest, and his own behaviour, some or all, procur'd him the general good-will of the two tribes; who went to *Shechem*, and there, in a

A a 2

' fo-

(a) 1 *Kings* xii. 1. and 2 *Chron.* x. 1. (b) 1 *Kings* xi. 12.  
(c) The main body of the tribe of *Benjamin* adher'd to *Rehoboam*, as appears 1 *Kings* xii. 23. and 2 *Chron.* xi. 1, &c. but probably some part of them, bordering upon the revolted tribes, might fall off with them to *Jeroboam*; which might give ground for that saying, that *there was none* (that is, no entire tribe) *that followed the house of David, but the tribe of Judah only*, 1 *Kings* xii. 20.

'solemn assembly made him their King (a)'. Now, tho' the drift of all this is apparently to support the claim of popular conventions in making Kings, yet I must take the liberty to demand, from what other motives than that of true loyalty, and a due regard to his birth-right, the two tribes could reasonably be induced to adhere to their King's son and heir, when the other ten rebell'd against him? what scripture-evidence to prove, that his father's favour, his mother's interest, and his own behaviour, should not be as much regarded in *Israel* as *Judab*? did his father ever express any extraordinary favour for him? or had his mother any particular interest after his father's death, to prevail with the two tribes, but not with the ten? if so, we may expect to find the chapter and verse! As to his own behaviour, 'tis plain, that was so very impolitick, as well as unpopular, that it could not possibly procure him any good will: but, instead thereof, if the two tribes had been *given to change*, like the rest, and not of truly loyal principles, they would most probably have voted the throne vacant, and placed another therein, by their own pretended authority, as the other ten did. But they, not regarding the rebellious practices of the rest, nor thinking greater numbers any argument in matters of right and duty, proceeded by themselves to recognize the natural right of their lawful King's son (even tho' they could promise themselves nothing from

(a) *Whist. Script. polit.* p. 34.

from his own declaration to them, but the most arbitrary tyranny,) as all the other tribes were ready too to have done, if they had not been acted by principles of human politicks, rather than those of religion and loyalty; and how much the publick good was effected thereby, will be seen in its proper place.

In the mean time, I shall proceed upon the succession of those Kings, who reign'd, according to the original law of hereditary right and proximity of blood, over the loyal tribes of *Judah* and *Benjamin*: who having been a *race of Kings* (as it confess'd) by *divine (a) appointment*, we may observe, that the preheminance of the primogeniture is admitted to be a divine right; (for 'tis plain, none of these following Kings had any other evidence of God's designation, than that of their birth, or hereditary right, tho' one of this author's friends sticks not to call it *blasphemy (b)* to say so!

But, before I come to the particulars, I shall take notice here, once for all, of a piece of criticism, fitter indeed to be expos'd, than seriously answer'd. Mr. *Whiston* (forgetful of the *impartiality* he pretends to in his *title page*,) when no other colours can be found to cast a blot upon this doctrine of hereditary right, takes upon him to *suppose*, (or presume rather) that wherever we meet with the *mother's name*, it is an argument, that such successor was not the *eldest son* and heir  
by

(a) *Bradbury's son of Tabcal*, 1708: (b) *Dr. Kennes's serm.*  
25 Sept. 1715, p. 11.



by descent. It 'seems to me (*says he*) an obscure indication, that he was not the first-born son; 'tho' I cannot say it is at all (*a*) certain'. However, he has endeavour'd, by this fallacy alone, to disparage almost the whole line of Kings, as well in *Judah*, as in *Israel*: but with how little justice or reason, I leave to the reader to judge from this one remark, that Mr. *Whiston* has unfortunately split upon a rock, at his very first launching out. For even *Rehoboam* himself, the first of all those in the kingdom of *Judah*, has his *mother's name* recorded with him (and that too twice in one (*b*) chapter, which is more than we usually meet with in the rest): and yet Mr. *Whiston* himself owns, that he 'succeeded *Solomon*, as it 'were of course; that is, no one else seems to 'have stood his competitor, he probably being 'the eldest, if not the only son (*c*)'. Which plainly demonstrates the absurdity of that his own peculiar observation! and therefore I shall take no further notice of it.

§ XLIII. As *Solomon* was succeeded-  
*The hereditary* ed by *Rehoboam* his son and *heir*, so  
*succession of Abi-* ed by *Rehoboam* his son and *heir*, so  
*jah.* was *Rehoboam* succeeded by *Abijah*  
 (or *Abijam*) his son and (*d*) *heir*. For, tho', 'tis true, we read, that *Rehoboam* had three sons by his former wives (*e*), and consequently suppose, that *Abijah* was not the eldest at the time that his father made him chief, to be ruler over his brethren; and

(*b*) Script. pol. p. 45. (*b*) 1 *Kin.* xiv. 21, 31. and 2 *Chron.* xii. 13. (*c*) Script. polit. p. 34. (*d*) 1 *Kin.* xiv. 31. and 2 *Chron.* xii. 16. (*e*) 2 *Chron.* xi. 19.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION 183

and *thought also to make him (a) King*, (which is indeed an evidence of a partial favour for him, during their lives;) yet it does by no means follow, that *Abijah* was not the eldest survivor at the time of his father's death, and his own succession to the throne: on the contrary, it no where appears, that they, or any one of them was living at that time. For if there had been any elder surviving, it is not to be doubted, but we should have heard something of his pretension; of which as there is not the least hint upon record, we may safely conclude, that they were all dead before their father, and that *Abijah* was his heir and lawful successor, by due course of inheritance: and the rather, for that we have a precedent for it in the same holy writings; wherein we find, that *Adonijah* had once had three elder brethren (b) too, one of whom, for ought that appears to the contrary, might have survived his father: and yet, because there is no mention of him, or his pretensions, but *Adonijah* is the next who puts in his claim to the inheritance, 'tis therefore reasonably presum'd, that all the elder were dead, tho' that is not recorded; and *Adonijah* is universally esteem'd to have been the eldest surviving son of *David*, at that demise of the crown. Thus it is justly argu'd, that since we read, that *Amnon* was murder'd, and *Abshalom* slain in battle, ' we may reasonably presume, that *Daniel*, or ' *Chileab*, as he is elsewhere called, died a nat-  
ral

(a) 2 Chron. xi. 22. (b) 2 Sam. iii. 2, 3. and 1 Chron. iii. 1, 2.

‘ral death before his father: for there appears  
 ‘no reason, why *Adonijah* should speak as he does,  
 ‘(1 *Kings* ii. 15.) but his priority of birth, or, in  
 ‘the modern language, his hereditary right, as  
 ‘eldest branch of the royal (*a*) family’. For as,  
 in that case, *Adonijah* asserted his own immediate  
 right, before the mother of *Solomon* (as before is  
 at large set forth,) so, in this, *Abijah* asserts his  
 to the whole inheritance, in as strong terms as is  
 possible, even to the face of him who had usurp’d  
 the greatest part thereof, and before all his army  
 (which I shall have occasion to mention hereafter,  
 in the case of *Jeroboam*, and to which I shall there-  
 fore refer my reader from this place.) And be-  
 sides, there is not the least appearance of any  
 other pretender, claiming by any prior right,  
 but *Abijah* did *peaceably* succeed *Rehoboam*, *with-*  
*out any opposition* (as Mr. *Whiston* (*b*) confes-  
 ses;) which is the very argument that prevails  
 with him to admit *Rehoboam* to have been the  
 next heir, *because*, says he, *no one else seems to*  
*have stood his competitor*; which, if it be a good  
 argument in one case, is surely as good in ano-  
 ther. Nay, further, there seems to be something  
 worth our notice, in the very phrase, which is  
 objected. For it is not said, that *Rehoboam* made,  
 or resolved to make, but only that *he thought*  
 (or had some thoughts, as we say,) *to make him*  
*King*: nor does *Abijah*’s succeeding to the crown  
 afterwards prove in the least, that he obtain’d  
 it

(*a*) *J. Archer*’s serm. at *Tunbridge Wells*, Aug. 8, 1714, p. 6.

(*b*) *Script. polit.* p. 34.

it only in consequence of that thought, but, for ought that can be prov'd to the contrary, as his right by survivorship. Much less can we argue (as Mr. *Whiston* does) because his father made him ruler among his brethren, in his own lifetime, that therefore he broke through the right of (a) primogeniture; for I know no law, that hinders a sovereign prince, from constituting his own inferior magistrates, without regard to age or family, tho' he may not do so, in appointing his successors in the throne.

But will it not put *Abijah's* hereditary right out of all dispute, if we observe, in the royal pedigree recorded by St. *Matthew*, that our blessed Saviour's title to the sceptre of the *Jews*, is deriv'd through *Abijah*, (as well as the rest of that royal line, herein set forth)? For if *Christ's* being the *Messiah* depends upon his being the son of *David* and *King of the Jews*, (as without question it does) then how can we make a doubt of the right of *Abijah*, (or any of the rest in that pedigree) without raising a strong objection against that of our blessed Saviour himself also?

§ XLIV. *Abijah* being thus proved a lawful King, pass we on to *Asha*, his son (b) and heir, who succeeded him; and who was himself succeeded by *Jehosaphat* his (c) son and heir; and *Jehosaphat* by *Jehoram* his (d) son and heir whose right of succession to the kingdom is particularly recorded,

B b

because

(a) Script. polit. p. 34. (b) 1 Kings xv. 8. and 2 Chron. xiv. 1. (c) 1 Kings xv. 24. and 2 Chron. xvii. 1. (d) 1 Kings xxii. 50.



## 186 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

(a) *because he was the first-born*; and *Jehoram* by *Abaziah* his (b) *son and heir*, without the least interruption: for, tho' we read, that he was then the *youngest son* of *Jehoram*, yet it follows, that he came not to the crown, till the *band of men that came with the Arabians to the camp, had slain all the* (c) *eldest*; so that he was the eldest son surviving, and consequently heir at law: which is a manifest indication, that the ordinary rule of succession was hereditary according to primogeniture.

Nevertheless here Mr. *Whiston* gives it another turn, in favour of the popular scheme, tho' one would think, nothing can be more express to the contrary. He says, '*the inhabitants of Jerusalem made Abaziah King, — being depriv'd of any other choice among the sons of Jehoram*': and proceeds to make this observation from it, '*here we see who they were, that usually made or recogniz'd Kings in Judah; even the people of the land, or, in this particular case, where there was no choice in the royal family, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the capital city* (d) *alone*'. But, with Mr. *Whiston's* good leave, the giving us the reason of the youngest son's succeeding his father (*because all the elder were dead*) plainly intimates, that he could not have been capable of it, if any of the elder had been left alive: and notwithstanding what he infers from the *inhabitants of Jerusalem making or recognizing Kings*, all that they

(a) 2 *Chron.* xxi. 3.      (b) 2 *Kings* viii. 24.      (c) 2 *Chron.* xxii. 1.      (d) *Scrip. polit.* p. 42.

they did, or could do, was no more than is done, in our own hereditary kingdom, upon every demise of the crown ; where the privy counsellors and the magistrates of the city of *London*, together with such others of the nobility, gentry, and inhabitants, as are at hand, make a solemn *proclamation* and *declaration* of the natural right of the next heir ; not thereby making him *King*, but recognizing, that he had the right inberent in him, by the laws of *God and nature*, and the fundamental laws of the land ; tho' our scripture politician does not distinguish, between making and recognizing of Kings ! Nay, that very phrase, which Mr. *Whiston* takes his objection from, *the people's making him king*, is honestly explain'd, even by *Grotius* himself (who was so far from being an enemy to the just rights of the people, that some of them quote him with as much assurance as the gospel it self ; ) who interprets this action of the people, to be no more than barely their placing him in the throne (as they did also afterwards *Joash* his son) which was his right (*viz.* by birth,) whether the people had given their vote or suffrage or (a) not.

§ XLV. HITHERTO the succession had *Joash*. been regular and uninterrupted, in the kingdom of *Judab*. But no sooner was *Abaziah* dead, than his mother *Atbaliab* (the daughter of the wicked *Abab*, the son of *Omri*, King of *Israel*) usurped the hereditary throne, and endeavour'd

B b 2

to

(a) *Grot.* in 2 *Chron.* xxii. 1. In folio locarunt, — nam regnum jure ipsi debebatur, sine ullis populi suffragiis.

to make herself a thorough settlement, by *destroying all the seed* (a) *royal*, except one who was happily hid from her: for (as a reverend and pious prelate well observed) ‘they that fear to lose their  
 ‘ usurped possessions, or to feel the revenge of  
 ‘ their treason and rebellion, never think them-  
 ‘ selves secured, or their usurpation settled, un-  
 ‘ til their unjust titles be sealed in the blood of  
 ‘ the right owner, and their own wicked lives  
 ‘ secured in the unmerited death of their innocent  
 ‘ (b) adversaries’.

And now, what was wanting to make *Athaliah* a *lawful sovereign*, that can be pleaded by any other usurper? ’tis plain, she wanted nothing but the hereditary right: for she had full and uninterrupted possession of all the power in the government, upwards of *six* (c) *years*, and the providence (as some call it) of success, and the people’s submission, and no other pretender in view, to interrupt her: and yet when she least dream’d of it, *Joash*, the right heir by birth (who had been miraculously preserv’d indeed by providence) was unexpectedly produc’d, and restor’d, and the usurper justly destroy’d; and then (notwithstanding their forc’d submission to her during her possession of the power) *all the people of the land rejoiced, and the city was quiet, after that they had slain Athaliah* (the usurper) *with the* (d) *sword*.

Here

(a) 2 *Kings* xi. 1, 2. and 2 *Chron.* xxii. 10, 11: (b) Bp. Griff. Williams’s seven treatises, 1661, fol. 21. (c) 2 *Kings* xi. 3, 4. and 2 *Chron.* xxii. 12.—xxiii. 1. (d) 2 *Kings* xi. 20. and 2 *Chron.* xxiii. 21.

## *the* REGAL SUCCESSION. 189

Here I beg leave to consider some of the arguments of a late author of great name, who affirms, ‘ that all sovereign princes, who are  
‘ settled in their thrones, are placed there by God,  
‘ and invested with his authority, and therefore  
‘ must be obey’d, by all subjects, as the *ministers of God*, without enquiring into their legal right and title to the (a) throne: — that  
‘ the scripture has given us no directions in this  
‘ case, but to submit, and pay all the obedience  
‘ of subjects to the present powers; it makes no  
‘ distinction, that ever I could find, between right-  
‘ ful Kings and usurpers, between Kings whom  
‘ we must, and whom we must not obey: but  
‘ the general rule is, *let every soul be subject to the  
‘ higher powers, for all power is of (b) God,*’ &c. To this I might fairly offer the cases of *David* and *Absalom*, *Joash* and *Athaliah*, as a full and clear confutation: but I chuse rather to lay before my reader the judgment of a divine, as learned, as honest, as unbiass’d, and (without the common *odium* of comparisons,) every way as worthy of credit as this author; and that is his own self: who assures us, that ‘ the most prosperous rebel is not  
‘ the higher power, while our natural prince, to  
‘ whom we owe obedience and subjection, is in  
‘ being: and therefore, tho’ such men may get  
‘ the power into their hands by God’s permission,  
yet

(a) Dr. *W. Sherlock*’s case of allegiance, 1691, p. 10. (b) *Ibid.* p. 18.



' yet not by God's ordinance; and he who resists  
 ' them does not resist the ordinance of God, but  
 ' the usurpations of (a) men.—*Athaliah* reign-  
 ' ed, and had the whole power of government in  
 ' her hands; but yet, this did not make her a  
 ' soveraign and irresistible prince, because *Joash*,  
 ' the son of *Abaziah*, the right heir of the crown,  
 ' was yet alive: and therefore, in the seventh  
 ' year, *Jehoiada* the priest set *Joash* upon the throne,  
 ' and slew *Athaliah*, and was guilty of no treason  
 ' or rebellion in doing so; which shews, that no  
 ' usurpation can extinguish the right and title of  
 ' a natural prince. Such usurpers, though they  
 ' have the possession of the supream power, yet  
 ' they have no right to it: and tho' God, for wise  
 ' reasons, may sometimes permit such usurpations,  
 ' yet, while his providence secures the persons of  
 ' such depos'd and banish'd princes from violence,  
 ' he secures their titles (b) too'. After all this,  
 with what veracity this author could affirm, that  
*the scripture makes no distinction, that ever he could*  
*find,*

(a) *Dr. W. Sherlock's case of resistance*, 1684, p. 128. (b) *Ibid.*  
 p. 131, 132. And here I shall subjoin the opinion of a noted  
 lawyer, who having cited the cases of *Abfalom's* and *Athaliah's*  
 usurpations, and their untimely deaths, as mere traytors and rebels,  
 (to confirm his principle, that an usurper can never gain any inte-  
 rest in the crown, to the prejudice of the rightful king or his heirs,)  
 assures us, that *as this was God's law among the Jews, so it was*  
*the ancient law of England, under the Britons, and continued so un-*  
*der the Saxons and Normans; as he proves by divers precedents,*  
*in confutation of that vulgar notion, that treason may be com-*  
*mitted against a King de facto, &c. Prynne's plea for the peers*, 1653,  
 p. 486.

*find*, I leave to the reader's reflection! especially when he might have found a plain distinction, as in the case of *Abfalom* (a) before mention'd; so also in this very place of scripture, where the Holy Ghost (who must be allow'd to be the best herald) never once gives the title of queen to *Athaliah*, tho' she was so long in peaceable possession, but appropriates the royal title to the rightful King, tho' out of possession, and in obscurity; calling *Joash* (b) *King* no less than five several times, even before his restoration: whereby 'tis manifest, the Holy Ghost grounded his title upon his proximity of blood only: and yet when the usurper saw the King standing in his place in the temple, she could have the assurance, to pervert the proper meaning of words, crying out *treason! treason* (c)! (or, as it is in the *Septuagint*, a *plot!* a *plot!*) tho' in truth, she herself was the great *traytor*; and those *plotters* (as she called them) the most loyal subjects and worthy patriots. For, it is truly observ'd, by a divine before quoted, that ' after God had once settled the succession of  
' the

(a) Pag. 146. (b) 2 Kings xi. 5, 7, 8, 11. and 2 Chron: xxiii. 3, 5, 7, 10. (c) 2 Kings xi. 14. and 2 Chron. xxiii. 13.

This puts me in mind of a just observation of the great Lord Bacon (Nov. Organ. l. i. in his works lately publish'd, vol. 1, fol. 277, 278.) that the giving wrong names to things (which he terms *Idola fori*,) is one of the principal causes that sciences are so often disturbed, and the understanding of men so much perplexed. And so doubtless, in matters of conscience and morality, the dressing up an uncreditable character, in the habit of reverence and dignity, is very apt to draw a false *Idea* upon the mind, and disorder the practice of the generality.

## 192 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

‘ the crown of *Israel*, in King *David*’s family, and  
 ‘ particularly on King *Solomon*’s issue, by primo-  
 ‘ geniture, then it was high treason for any to put  
 ‘ by the lawful heir and successor, altho’ the said  
 ‘ heir was an idolater, and never so bad, as  
 ‘ to either faith or (a) manners’. For the better  
 proof whereof, he quotes that interrogation of  
*Elibu* to *Job*; *shall even he that hateth right (b) go-*  
*vern?* &c. Where the point of interrogation is  
 altogether affirmative, and implies, that he that  
 hateth right, shall and ought, however, to govern  
 when he has a lawful title so to do; and may not  
 be excluded or depos’d under that pretence of his  
 want of grace. Nay, and ’tis declar’d even by  
 the kirk of *Scotland*, and their friends in *England*, in  
 their *confession of faith*, ‘ that no difference in reli-  
 ‘ gion, or even infidelity, does take away the right  
 ‘ of the King’ (c).

This

(a) *Fenner*’s prerog. of primog. p. 29. (b) *Job* xxxiv. 17.  
 (c) Chap. 23. Whence the principle of deposing or excluding law-  
 ful Kings from their just rights, for difference in religion, had its  
 original, I shall leave to the *Jesuits* and *Puritans*, to agree between  
 themselves: but since their appearing in the world, there has been  
 great uneasiness given to sovereign princes on that account; the *Je-*  
*suits* using all their artifices against *protestant* princes, and the *Puritans*,  
 the like against *popish*. But to be somewhat more particular; ’tis  
 well known, that in the infancy of our reformation, a scheme  
 was laid to defeat the lawful heir of King *Edward VI.* because she  
 was a Papist: but, at the same time, *Elizabeth* the younger  
 sister (tho’ a Protestant) was to be excluded, as well as *Q. Mary*,  
 to make way for lady *Jane Grey*, a distant relation; and at last  
 the principal manager of that design was discover’d to be a Papist  
 himself!

## the REGAL SUCCESSION. 193

This case may afford us just ground to observe, that ‘ God loves to shew himself, and in an eminent  
 ‘ manner to take part with right and justice against  
 ‘ those mighty oppressors of the earth, who, like  
 ‘ an overflowing flood, would bear down all before  
 ‘ (a) them ’. And in what a manner that is, may be learnt from that gracious declaration, *I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and I will save*

C c

*them*

himself. The many plots of the *Jesuits* against our *Q. Elizabeth* to remove her from her throne, as well as their open rebellions, against *K. Henry IV. of France*, to keep him out of his, are easily to be discovered in the well-pen'd histories of their respective reigns. No sooner was *Q. Elizabeth* dead, but the *Jesuits* were as diligent to defeat *K. James I.* of his undoubted right of succession, by the help of their infamous *Doleman* (alias *Parsons*) and other tools; which the reader may find a large account of in the preface to *Mason's vindication of our church lately printed*: and when that design was happily render'd ineffectual, the next wicked plot was to have blown him out of his throne again by gun-powder! On the other hand, the puritan party were as busy all around us, in their rebellions and usurpation in *Scotland, France, Holland and Bohemia*, (all chiefly under the pretence of religion,) tho' they were, with much ado, kept under here during those two reigns. But when *K. Charles I.* inherited the throne, it was his unhappy fate to be pursu'd to death, by the united pack of *Jesuits* and *Fanatics*, tho' with the different cry of *popery* on the one hand, and *heresy* on the other; but on both sides on the same pretence of a difference in religion! However, in all these various revolutions, the church of *England* (properly so call'd) was so far from being actuated by such *Jesuitico-puritanical* principles, that (as *Dr. Sherlock* truly said) in his *serm. 29. May, 1685, p. 31, 32.*) it has *suffered with its prince, but never yet rebell'd against him; being loyal upon firm and steady principles, and without reserve*; whereas, ‘ there can be no security of those men's loyalty, whose religion, in any case, teaches ‘ them to rebell.’ (a) *Tillof. serm. 16. Apr. 1690, p. 29.*



*them by the Lord their God ; and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battel, by horses, nor by (a) horsemen : that is to say, ' when there is no servant ' to draw a bow, no subject to manage a sword, ' no army to fight a battel ; when there is no ' visible appearance of any force, then is God's ' hour to shew (b) mercy ' ; so that the cause of ' truth and righteousness ought never to be given up as desperate.*

And here we have likewise a clear light to distinguish the publick good from all specious pretences. For we cannot doubt, but *Athaliah* would (as other usurpers usually do) endeavour to blind the people's eyes with plausible professions and declarations, how much the publick good would be advanc'd by her filling the throne, and particularly, how much it would be better for them to have a person of her age and experience, than *a child to be their prince, and a babe to rule over (c) them.* But however, the publick good and tranquillity could not be truly attain'd, till the next natural-born heir (tho' a tender infant) was restor'd to his right. And it is remarkable, that, when command was given to kill the usurper and her adherents, none were slain with her, but only *Mattan, the priest of (d) Baal.* From whence we may judge of the constant and inseparable correspondence, there is between usurpation and false (or immoral) worship ; whereas no sooner was

(a) *Hof.* i. 7.      (b) *Allingt. serm.* 1653, p. 92.      (c) *Isa.* iii. 4.      (d) *2 Kings* xi. 18. and *2 Chron.* xxiii. 17.

was the right heir restor'd, but the true religion was also restor'd, and protected by him.

Before I leave this case, it may be proper to take particular notice of the conduct of *Jehoiada* the high-priest; because from the part that he bore, in the deposition of *Athaliah*, and the restoration of *Joash*, some pretence has been taken (by certain weak, or factious Papists) to favour the Pope's having a power to depose princes: but with how little reason will easily appear. For it has been already shewn, that *Athaliah* was not a (a) Queen, but a meer usurper; and therefore, to argue from her case, to that of a lawful prince, is absurd and ridiculous. Besides, it is plain, that what *Jehoiada* did, was not by virtue of any ecclesiastical authority: for he was not only (in right of his wife) the *Prochein Amie* (as the lawyers call it) or next of kin to the royal infant, but, by the special providence of God (which is most conspicuous in the protection and preservation of lawful princes) was also become the guardian and protector of his sacred (b) person; nor did he do any thing, till he had first strengthen'd himself, by

C c 2

gain-

(a) Mr. *Whiston* makes no scruple to call her Queen *Athaliah*, (script. polit. p. 97, 103.) tho' contrary to the scripture: and some people affect to call every thing a King or Queen, that, right or wrong, gets a crown upon its head. I know, it was a maxim with Dr. *Sherlock*, that 'we must give the title of King to such a prince, when we live in the country where he is owned for King; because it is a piece of good manners': (case of alleg. p. 17.) But that is not Mr. *Whiston's* case; or if it had, I do not think it very good manners, to the king at least, to make a complement of the royal titles to a known usurper. (b)  
2 Kings xi. 4. and 2 Chron. xxii. 11, 12,

## 196 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

gaining to his party such of the *captains*, of the *Levites*, and the *fathers* of (a) *Israel*, as he thought fit, for his assistance. Neither did he any more, than what every private subject lawfully might and ought to do: and for this he produc'd a very good warrant from the word of God: *Behold* (says he) *the king's son shall reign, as the Lord hath said of the sons of* (b) *David*; which is admitted to have been a *divine* (c) *entail*, as likewise that 'there can be no prescription against a divine (d) right.' From which alone (if we had nothing else to the same purpose) we may perceive, that it was the want of this divine hereditary right, which made *Athaliah* an usurper; and not that of the *choice* of the (e) *people*, as Mr. *Whiston* insinuates. Nor indeed can we reasonably suppose, that she had not the choice of the people (or at least something that often passes for their consent,) since she was able to maintain herself in the throne so many years, and the king had no sanctuary left but the temple of the Lord: however, as that was a place of the greatest security to the lord's vicegerent, so the high priest was the only person qualify'd to have the care of him there; and consequently the only one who could restore him to his longing subjects. In short, so far is this case from serving the Pope's (f) turn, or making good his pretensions, that (as  
some

(a) 2 *Kings* xi. 4. and 2 *Chron.* xxiii, 1, 2. (b) — 3. and 2 *Sam.* vii. 12. 1 *Kings* xi. 4 — ix. 5. 2 *Chron.* vi. 10, 16. — vii. 18.  
(c) *Sherl.* case of alleg. p. 35. (d) *Rye's* treat. against the Nonjur. vol. i. p. 55. (e) *Script. polit.* p. 43: (f) if the Papists will

some moderate Papists themselves confess) it  
 ‘ proveth nothing, but that it is lawful for a state  
 ‘ or commonwealth to depose an usurper, and  
 ‘ restore the true heir to his right; and not that  
 ‘ he had any authority to depose any lawful prince,  
 ‘ were he otherwise never so exorbitant in life,  
 ‘ manners and belief, or cruel in his (a) govern-  
 ‘ ment’.

§ XLVI. BY this restoration of *Joash* was *Amaziah*.  
 the hereditary succession turn’d again into its right  
 course: but, after he had *reigned forty years*, some  
 of his own rebellious *servants made a conspiracy, and*  
*slew (b) him*. However, those traytors and parri-  
 cides were not audacious enough to justify that  
 regicide, much less to attempt the exclusion of  
 the right heir from his inheritance: for *Amaziah*  
 his (c) *son immediately reigned in his stead*; and did  
 not forget to do justice upon those who had mur-  
 der’d *the king his (d) father*.

§ XLVII. BUT as he succeeded his *Uzziah*.  
 father in the throne, so did he in his tragical  
 fate: for he was also *slain* by certain (e) conspi-  
 rators. But *then all the people of Judah took Uz-*  
 ziah,

will needs have a good precedent in this case for any thing, I beg  
 leave to recommend it as such for the marriage of the clergy: for  
 ’tis plain, that *Jehoshabeath*, who secur’d the person of her royal  
 nephew, was *the wife of Jehoiada the priest*, 2 Chron. xxii. 11.

(a) *Warmings*. moder. def. of the oath of alleg. 1612, p. 13.  
 (b) 2 Kings xii. 20. and 2 Chron. xxiv. 25. (c) 2 Kings xii. 21.  
 and 2 Chron. xxiv. 27. (d) 2 Kings xiv. 5. and 2 Chron. xxv. 3.  
 (e) 2 Kings xiv. 19. and 2 Chron. xxv. 27.



## 198 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

ziah, (or *Azariah*, as he is elsewhere call'd) and made him king in the room of his father (a) *Amaziah*.

Here our impartial scripture-politician (who catches at every occasion to disparage the right of proximity of blood) triumphs at the expression of the people's making *Azariah* king, &c. 'It is here very plain, (*says he*) that it was not any inde-feasible right of primogeniture, but the unanimous choice or recognition of the people, that made him (b) King'. For which, nevertheless, he has no other warrant, but the vulgar phrase in our translation: and that is not to be understood of the people's giving a right of government to the king; but only that they put him in actual possession of the regal power, to whom it belong'd by right of primogeniture (as I have observ'd (c) above,) and paid their homage and allegiance to him accordingly. But I wonder, that this zealous asserter of the power of the people did not here also take notice of a considerable stretch of it, which (tho' not express'd in the sacred text) appears by the chronology. For, by comparison of the places here cited, we may find, that *Amaziah's* murder happen'd fifteen years after the death of *Jehoash*, son of *Jehoahaz* King of (d) *Israel*; which *Jehoash* was succeeded by *Jeroboam* his (e) son: so that *Uzziah*, of right, became King of *Judah* fifteen years after this *Jeroboam's* accession to the throne

(a) 2 *Kings* xiv. 21. and 2 *Chron.* xxvi. 1. (b) *Whist.* script. polit. p. 45. (c) Page 197. (d) 2 *Kings* xiv. 17. and 2 *Chron.* xxv. 25. (e) 2 *Kings* xiii. 13, — xiv. 16.

throne of *Israel*; whereas, in fact, we are told, that he did not *begin to reign till the twenty and seventh year of (a) Jeroboam*; from whence we may perceive, that the right heir of *Judah* was kept out of his throne about twelve years. During which time, some people are pleas'd to tell us, that ' the states of *Judah* (their King being destroyed) seiz'd the government, and turned themselves into a (b) commonwealth': but indeed the Holy Ghost has not given us any light into that dark transaction, neither can I any where discover any body of people among the *Jews*, vested with such authority, as to enable them to take upon themselves the exercise of the supreme power; and much less in disinheritson of their rightful King. Besides, tho' *Amaziah* himself was destroyed, yet his throne could not be vacant: for he left a son, this *Uzziah*, tho' a tender infant, in whose name at least, and by whose authority, the sovereignty ought to have been administer'd from the time of his father's death, without any *interregnum*; which is inconsistent with the being of an hereditary kingdom. ' However, it is not ' improbable, that those conspirators, who slew ' his father, might (according to the usual policy of traytors) seek to secure themselves from ' the punishment due for their offence, by their ' voluntary incurment of a more criminous guilt: ' only thus much I am assur'd of, that if this were ' the

(a) 2 *Kings* xv. 1. (b) Dr. Fran. Carswell's aff. serm. at *Abington*, 6 Aug. 1689, p. 4.

‘ the first institution of a *polarchy* (as this author here seems to think it was,) the devil was the author of it; for the foundation of it was laid in rebellion, murder, usurpation, which were never any of God’s (a) works’. And ’tis plain from the text, that whoever the instruments were in that usurpation, the people did at length recover their liberty, when their rightful sovereign was restor’d to his throne; as ours here in *England* also did, after another of the same length of time.

Before I proceed to the next case, I must stop to consider the force of their arguments, who would make this *Uzziah*’s case as precedent for the Pope or people’s right to depose their Kings. ’Tis true, he was an undoubted lawful King: and the scripture informs us, that when he *went into the temple of the Lord to burn incense — the priests withstood him, saying, It appertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the Lord, but to the priests, the sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to burn incense; go out of the sanctuary, for thou hast trespass’d, neither shall it be for thine honour unto the Lord (b) God.* But, if we consider, that the regal and sacerdotal powers were distinct and independent on each other, and that King *Uzziah*’s invading and intruding himself into the high-priest’s office, was death by the law of (c) God; surely we shall find reason to think, that the behaviour of

(a) Dr. Mich, *Hudson* of governm. 1647, p. 90. (b) 2 *Chron.* xxvi. 16, &c. (c) *Exod.* xxx. 7. and *Numb.* xviii. 7.

of the priests was very dutiful, to expostulate with him (as they did) concerning his great offence, and the danger of it, in order only to prevent their sovereign from committing a deadly sin : for they did not presume to offer him any violence, but left him to the chastisement of God Almighty (whom they knew to be, as we also do every day acknowledge him, *the only Ruler of princes*) who thereupon punish'd his presumption with the plague of leprosy. Then indeed, we read that *they thrust him out* : but we are told, at the same time, that *himself hastened also to go out, because the Lord had smitten him* ; which plainly shews, that there was, even then, no violence offer'd him. He had incurr'd the penalty of death : but as there was no human tribunal to authorize the execution of it upon their king ; therefore Almighty God, the *King of Kings*, took him into his own hands, and humbled his proud heart, which was thus *lifted up to his destruction*, by that loathsome disease under which he died. And yet we are told with some assurance, that *Uzziab*, ‘ between being thrust  
‘ or affrighted out of his kingdom, run away, and  
‘ left it ; — *and that* hereupon the states of *Judah*  
‘ convened, and, their King having thus left them,  
‘ for the present juncture they set *Jotham*, the  
‘ King's son, over the King's house, to administer  
‘ the government, — and finding him an excel-  
‘ lent prince, in a short time after, they advanc'd  
‘ him to the throne, during the life of his (a)  
‘ father ’. Thus can men of quick invention

D d

make

(a) Dr. *Car/w.* as before, p. 5.



make even the word of God itself, like a nose of wax, to suit any mask they think fit to put on, according to their own fancy and disposition ! But tho' such open perversion of the holy scripture is unpardonable in any one, it is still more abominable in clergymen, (who are solemnly set apart to *be faithful dispensers of the word of God, in the name of the holy trinity!*) and especially from the pulpit, thus to blaspheme. For, in the case before us, there is no colour of scripture for such a suppos'd abdication of the kingdom, or *convention of the states*, much less of deposing the king, as this author suggests ; but quite the contrary : For, being a *leper unto the day of his death*, he was thereby incapable of any business, and obliged to dwell (a) alone ; and therefore, Jotham his son was over the King's house, judging the people of the (b) land, tho' not as King, but as the King's vicerent only, during his father's life. Which, by the way, affords us a very good remark, what is to be done, in case of a King's being a lunatick, an idiot, or under any other personal incapacity to answer the ends of government : viz. that the next in blood, that is capable, ought to govern ; tho' not in his own name, but in the name of the King, and by his authority ; as Jotham did, during his father's leprosy, without affecting to take upon himself the title of King.

## § XLVIII. BUT

(a) *Levit. xiii. 46.*(b) *2 Chron. xxvi. 21.*

§ XLVIII. BUT, after the natural death of *Uzziab*, and not before, we read that *Jotham*, (a) *his son*, reigned in his stead. And he was succeeded by *Abaz*, (b) *his son* and heir: and he by *Hezekiah*, (c) *his son* and heir: and he by *Manasseh*, (d) *his son* and heir: and he by *Amon*, (e) *his son* and heir. Against whose respective successions, in virtue of their hereditary right, I find no objection attempted to be made, except that of Mr. *Whiston's*, concerning their *mother's* (f) *name* (before sufficiently expos'd); under colour whereof alone, he has ventur'd to disparage most of them, contrary to scripture, reason, and (for ought I can yet see) common sense! But in the case of *Manasseh*, I own, he makes a very pertinent and useful observation. For indeed, 'it will here deserve our attention, that during the time of *Manasseh's* captivity at *Babylon*, the nation did not (*vote the throne vacant*, and) set up another king; but owned him for their King all the while, notwithstanding such his absence and imprisonment; and when he was brought again to (g) *Jerusalem*, he thereby was brought again (*that is restor'd*) to his kingdom also, without any new difficulty (b)'. To which I shall take leave

*Jotham,*  
*Ahaz,*  
*Hezekiah,*  
*Manasseh,*  
*Amon.*

D d 2 to

(a) 2 Kings xv. 7. and 2 Chron. xxvi. 23: (b) 2 Kings xv. 38. and 2 Chron. xxvii. 9. (c) 2 Kings xvi. 20. and 2 Chron. xxviii. 27. (d) 2 Kings xx. 21. and 2 Chron. xxxii. 33. (e) 2 Kings xxi. 18. and 2 Chron. xxxiii. 20. (f) *Whist.* script polit. p. 45, 46. (g) 2 Chron. xxxiii. 13. (h) *Script. polit.* p. 46.

to add another to the same purpose: and that is, that, after *Nebuchadnezzar's* having been in a state of madness (or, as it is call'd in the scripture, *driven from men, to dwell with the beasts of the field*) for *seven* years; no sooner did his *reason* return to him, but *his counsellors and his lords sought unto him, and he was establisht in* (that is, restor'd to) *his (a) kingdom*; the line of succession having not been broke, nor the people discharg'd from their allegiance on that account. And it is farther remarkable, that *the Lord*, in whose *hand the hearts of Kings are*, and, who *turneth them whithersoever he (b) will*, was pleas'd to change both these princes, from wicked and cruel ones, to become truly penitent and gracious.

But I must also observe, that these two cases do flatly contradict another remark of our *scripture politician*, where, speaking of the duty of subjects to their sovereigns, he accounts them bound to ‘ bear patiently the hardships they endure under their lawful Kings, till it pleases God, by ‘ their death, or otherwise, to deliver them from ‘ oppression under them. I say, by their death or ‘ otherwise *says he*: for we may observe, that ‘ any other method of providence, which removes ‘ such a tyrant or oppressor from the government ‘ over us, does also deliver us from our obligation ‘ to obedience to him; there being, in all the bible, I think, no obedience ever required to any ‘ other prince or power, than that which actually ‘ has

(a) *Dan. iv. 32, 36.*(b) *Prov. xxi. 1.*

‘ has dominion over men (a) ’. And so says another, that ‘ our allegiance was no longer obligatory, than whilst the throne was filled by the ‘ person it was due (b) to ’ : both which, with other’s of the like strain, are set exactly to the tune of *Anth. Asheam*, and almost in the very same words ; who boldly affirm’d, that ‘ we are bound ‘ to own princes, so long as it pleases God to give ‘ them the power to command us : and when we ‘ see others possess of their powers, we may then ‘ say, that the King of Kings hath chang’d our ‘ (c) vice-roys ’ ; meaning that *Oliver* was then to be God’s vicegerent, and not King *Charles* ! But here, I would inquire of Mr. *Whiston*, whether he does not look upon *Manasseh* and *Nebuchadnezzar* to have been *otherwise removed by providence, from the government over their respective subjects, before they were finally removed by death* ? And, if so, whether, during such other removal, their subjects were *deliver’d from their obligation of obedience to them* ? And whether, upon such supposed deliverance, any other object of allegiance, was apply’d unto, and plac’d in the vacant throne ? Sure I am, the learned Dr. *Sherlock* was once very positive, that *tho’ the tree was cut down, yet while the stump of the roots was left in the earth, the kingdom should be sure to the natural prince* ; as he plainly prov’d from the (d) bible : yea, and Mr. *Whiston*

(a) Script. pol. p. 58.

(b) N. Marsh. def. of constit. p. 111.

(c) *Ashe. seaf. disc.* (to reconcile men to the revolution in 1648) reprinted 1689, in 4to, p. 45.

(d) *Sherl. case of resist.* p. 132.



## 206 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

*Whiston* himself has own'd as much, in the case of *Manasseh* before cited.

§ XLIX. *AMON* having succeeded his father *Manasseh*, as aforesaid, did not enjoy his throne above *two years*, before certain of his traitorous servants conspir'd against him, and slew him in his own (a) house: and yet the right of succession was not thereby defeated. For the people of the land (well sensible both of the heinousness of that treason and regicide, and of their indispensable duty in such a case) slew all them that had conspired against King *Amon*; and the people of the land made (or rather recogniz'd) *Josiah* his son King in his (b) stead. And he being then but a child, of eight years (c) old, his case affords us this useful observation, that the people, even in those troublesome times, never thought of breaking through the law of God and nature, under any pretence of the publick good, but readily admitted the next natural heir, tho' a tender infant, and moreover the son of a wicked and idolatrous father, to his hereditary throne, according to their natural allegiance. For which their loyalty, they were sufficiently rewarded by God Almighty: who made that infant such a blessing to his people, that like unto him was there no King before him, that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of *Moses*, neither after him arose there any like (d) him; and

(a) 2 Kings xxi. 23. and 2 Chron. xxxiii. 24. (b) 2 Kings xxi. 24. and 2 Chron. xxxiii. 25. (c) 2 Kings xxii. 1. and 2 Chron. xxxiv. 1. (d) 2 Kings xxiii. 25.

and his reign was prolong'd, for the publick good indeed, to *one and thirty (a) years*. So that these loyal *Jews* wisely preserv'd their loyalty and allegiance for the publick good; whereas they who renounce their natural allegiance, under the colour of the publick good, very often find themselves disappointed, and instead thereof are the cause of their country's ruin!

§ L. ONE instance whereof (tho' every reader may easily recollect others) follows immediately upon the death of this good *Josiah*. For the people of the land took *Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah*,

*Interruption  
of the succession  
the cause of  
ruin.*

and anointed him, and made him King in his father's (b) stead: by the comparison of whose age, with that of his brother (c) *Eliakim*, we shall find *Eliakim* to have been 'the elder brother to *Jehoahaz*, 'and consequently the right heir to the crown: 'but he being injuriously refused, the younger 'was set up; and it succeeded (d) accordingly'. However, this is the less strange, if we consider either the natural result of popular conventions (which generally begin in irregularity, and end in confusion), or the condition of their affairs at that time. For, as, in *Josiah's* days, there were great wars betwixt the Kings of *Egypt* and *Affyria*, (the two constant enemies, and rival neighbours of the *Jews*, so, being in fast friendship with the latter, he was of course liable to be evil-treated by the

(a) 2 Kings xxii. 1. and 2 Chron. xxxiv. 1. (b) 2 Kings xxiii. 30. and 2 Chron. xxxvi. 1. (c) 2 Kings xxiii. 31, 36 and 2 Chron. xxxvi. 2, 5. (d) Mayer in loco.

the former. And of this he was so sensible, that no sooner did the *Egyptian* draw his sword against the *Assyrian*, than *Josiab* made head against him; in which quarrel he was (a) slain. After whose death (the *Assyrian* being still their ally) they, for the publick good (as probably, in those circumstances, it might appear to them) venturing to break through all laws and rights, in a case of necessity, and forgetting the old maxim, *nihil utile, nisi quod sit honestum*, prefer'd the younger brother (who was of their faction, and so the more fit for their turn) before the elder. But, alas! such were the miseries, instead of benefits, ensuing upon that fatal revolution, that, that very breach in the constitution, not only administer'd sufficient cause of dissentions among themselves, but also gave the *Egyptian* a good handle for a fresh invasion; which he taking hold of, depos'd the usurper, and restor'd the right heir to his father's throne. Where 'it is observable, concerning the  
' *Israelites*, that, when they went about to secure  
' themselves by subtile devices and contrivances  
' of their own, making leagues and confederacies with the King of *Egypt*, and other neighbour princes, so often they were foiled and  
' baffled, and overcome by their enemies: but  
' when they put their trust in *God*, and committed themselves to his protection, he preserv'd  
' and deliver'd them from the greatest (b)  
' dangers'. Thus here we read, *that Pharaoh*  
Nechoh

(a) 2 *Kings* xxiii. 29. and 2 *Chron.* xxxv. 20, &c. (b) *Stillingfl.* serm. Nov. 13, 1678, p. 30.

Nechoh made Eliakim, *the son of Josiah, King, in the room of Josiah his (a) father* : which is the more remarkable, (in favour of the primogeniture) because, tho' *Jeboabaz* had been some time in possession of the throne, by the voice of the people, yet, neither is there the least record of any of his acts, nor even so much as the bare mention of him as King ; but his pretended reign stands, as it were, in a *parenthesis*, and his elder brother, the King *de jure*, is recorded King immediately from their father's death.

Thus was the hereditary succession regularly asserted, and maintain'd against all opponents, in the kingdom of *Judab*, according to the divine right of primogeniture : till *Nebuchadnezzar*, coming up, put the kingdom under a tribute, and afterwards, returning, carry'd all together into captivity to (b) *Babylon*.

'Tis true indeed, it pleas'd God to restore these two loyal tribes to their own country again : but as they were even then under a kind of vassalage to the neighbouring potentates, and therefore not capable of enjoying the rights of a free and independent government, I shall take no further notice of them here.

§ LI. AND now, having gone through the succession of the several Kings of *Judab*, I beg leave to appeal to every unprejudic'd reader, whether I have not made it clear to a demon-

*Hereditary right the ordinary rule of succession among God's people.*  
stration,

(a) 2 Kings xxiii. 34. (b) — xxiv. 12, &c. and 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, &c.



stration, that the ordinary rule of succeeding to the throne, among God's people, was by right of birth, in an hereditary course of descent, according to primogeniture and proximity of blood, without regard to the choice of the people, or to the personal virtue, goodness and desert of the prince: and that whenever any interruption of that hereditary right was attempted, it was always condemn'd as rebellion and usurpation; unless where God Almighty, for reasons best known to himself, thought fit to interpose and exert his divine prerogative, not by dark and doubtful events, but by an express revelation, as it is shewn in the case of (a) *Solomon*. I cannot therefore but, with great concern, reflect upon the strong prejudices of such men, as confidently affirm, that 'the indefeasibleness of hereditary right is by no means agreeable to the mind of God in the (b) scriptures! — has not the least countenance afforded it in the word of (c) God! — where (they pretend) it appears, that God Almighty has ever been very solicitous, that the several nations of the world should be well govern'd; but not so that any particular families should govern (d) them'! &c. whereas the contrary is evident, in divers places of holy scripture, where the crown of *Judah* was entail'd, by God himself, upon the particular family of *David*, and his heirs (by *Solomon*)

(a) Pag 153. (b) *Lovel's* serm. 15 Nov. 1715, p. 22. (c) *Archer's* serm. 8 Aug. 1714, p. 13. (d) *Whist.* script. polit. dedicat. p. iii.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION 211

lomon) for ever, even to him and to his sons, by a covenant of (a) salt.

§ LII. AND, as I have shewn, *And passive obedience their indispensable duty.* how sacred and inviolable the persons and authority of the Jewish Kings were during the time of that monarchy, it cannot be impertinent, briefly to consider what obligations the Jews were still under, to be subject to the lawful higher powers of that country into which they were carry'd captive. ' Now the prophet ' *Jeremiab* had given an exprefs command to ' them, *seek the peace of the city, whither I have ' caused you to be carry'd away captives, and pray ' unto the Lord for it; for in the peace thereof shall ' ye have (b) peace:* which made it a necessary ' duty to be subject to those powers, under whose ' government they liv'd. And accordingly we ' find, that *Mordecai* discover'd the treason of *Big-thana* and *Teresh*, two of the King's chamberlains, ' the keepers of the door, who sought to lay hand on ' the King (c) *Ahasuerus*. And how numerous ' and powerful the Jews were at this time, and ' what great disturbance they could have given ' to the empire, appears evidently from the book ' of *Esther*. King *Ahasuerus*, upon the suggestions of *Haman*, had granted a decree, for ' the destruction of the whole people of the Jews.

E e 2

— This

(a) 2 Sam. vii. 12, 19. 1 Kings ii. 4. — viii. 25. — xi. 12, 34, 36, 38. — xv. 4. 2 Kings viii. 19. 1 Chron. xvii. 17. 2 Chron. vi. 16. — xiii. 4. — xxi. 7. — xxiii. 3. (b) Jerem. xxix. 7. N.B. Those were the rightful higher powers in that country, (c) Esth. vi. 2.

## 212 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

‘ — This decree could never be revers’d again :  
 ‘ — and therefore, when *Esther* had found favour  
 ‘ with the King, all that could be done for the  
 ‘ *Jews* was to grant another decree for them to  
 ‘ defend themselves ; which accordingly was done,  
 ‘ and the effect of it was this, that *the Jews that*  
 ‘ *were in Shushan* — *slew three hundred men ; —*  
 ‘ *but the other Jews that were in the King’s provinces*  
 ‘ — *slew of their foes seventy and five thousand,*  
 ‘ *and had rest from their (a) enemies.* Without this  
 ‘ decree, *Mordecai* did not think it lawful to re-  
 ‘ sist, (which yet was a case of as great extremi-  
 ‘ ty and barbarous cruelty as could ever happen,)  
 ‘ which made him put *Esther* upon so hazardous  
 ‘ an attempt, as to venture into the King’s pre-  
 ‘ sence without being call’d ; which was death by  
 ‘ their law, unless the King should graciously *hold*  
 ‘ *out the golden scepter* to (b) them : and yet, when  
 ‘ they had obtain’d this decree, they were able to  
 ‘ defend themselves, and to destroy their enemies ;  
 ‘ which is as famous an example of passive obe-  
 ‘ dience, as can be met with in any (c) history.

§ LIII. HAVING thus done with  
 the Kings of *Judah*, properly so call’d,  
 I must desire my reader to turn back  
 with me to the fatal breach, which  
 was made among the peculiar people of God, im-  
 mediately after the death of *Solomon* : when ten of  
 the twelve tribes, instead of acknowledging the  
 natural right of *Rehoboam*, his son and heir, took  
 upon

The revolt of  
 ten tribes from  
 the heirs of  
 David.

(a) *Esth.* ix. 15, 16, 17.  
 of resist. p. 39, &c.

(b) — iv. 11.

(c) *Sherl.* case

upon themselves the liberty, totally to withdraw their allegiance due to him by birth, and to set up a government of their own, under the conduct of *Jeroboam*, distinct from, and independent upon, the house of *David*, as before (a) is briefly hinted at. But by the way, 'tis very remarkable, that even these revolvers did not once think of degenerating so far from the common rule of all nations in those days, as to change the form of monarchy into a commonwealth, tho' they did presume to set up an idol of their own, with the full power and title of King of *Israel*: and it will not seem strange to any sensible person, that in a government so founded, he will meet with little or nothing but tumult, resistance, murder, and usurpation.

§ LIV. 'Tis true, there is a colour of a divine right in the establishment thereof. For we read, that *when the Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned — from that which the Lord commanded, he said unto him, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and will give it to thy servant; — howbeit I will not rend away all the kingdom, but will give one (b) tribe to thy son, for David my servant's sake, and for Jerusalem's sake which I have (c) chosen: and again, to Jeroboam himself, by the mouth of Abijah the prophet, behold, I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee, — and I will take thee*

*The grounds of that revolution examin'd.*

(a) Pag. 179. (b) See this explain'd, in page 179. (c) 1 Kings xi. 9, &c.



## 214 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

*thee, and thou shalt reign according to all that thy soul desireth, and shalt be King over Israel* (a), &c. which Mr. *Whiston* (without considering the circumstances of the case) ventures to call *his* (b) *commission from God*; and upon which grounds alone, a certain preacher, as rashly affirms, that *Jeroboam* had more of a divine right to the government than *Saul* (c) had'. Yet, nevertheless, upon better examination, these authors may discover, that *Jeroboam* never had a *commission* for what he did; and that his advancement to the throne was far short of a divine right. For,

*First*, The words here cited do not convey any authority at all, but are only a prophetic declaration of what should happen to the house of *Solomon* for his sins; so that they no way concern that action, but only the event: 'and precedent predictions of future events are so far from carrying the nature of precepts, to warrant the actions of those persons whom God in his providence permits to be instruments of bringing those events to pass, that sometimes they seem rather to put on the condition of caveats to give them warning, that they presume not to interpose themselves as God's coadjutors, in his own undertakings, unless they have their commission from him, which when they do, it commonly succeeds with them (d) accordingly'.  
*Secondly*, We do not find, that the prophet, who de-

(a) 1 Kings xi. 31, &c. (b) *Whist. script. polit.* p. 32.  
(c) T. *Bradbury's* serm. 5 Nov. 1711, p. 12. (d) *Chr. Harvey's* right rebel, 1661, p. 83, 84.

deliver'd this message to *Jeroboam*, did either then or at any other time anoint him, as (a) *Saul*, (b) *David*, and others were, when they were design'd to the regal character ; nor did he give him a commission, or any other evidence, or token of God's actually making him a King. *Thirdly*, This promise (if such it may be esteem'd) to *Jeroboam*, was at best but conditional, *if thou wilt hearken unto all that I command thee, and wilt walk in my ways, and do that is right in my sight, to keep my statutes and my commandments, as David my servant (c) did* : which condition none ever took less care to perform than he did on his part ; so that he could not found any divine right upon such conditional expressions, whatever they were. But *Fourthly*, the words, in a fair construction, cannot be extended any further than to a bare permission, or the giving way to *Jeroboam's* aspiring ambition, in order to make use of him as the instrument to execute God's decreed punishment upon the house of *Solomon* ; as may be understood by comparing them with others of the like import in the holy scriptures. For, as I (d) have intimated, in the case of *Absalom*, God's message to *David* was, in much the same terms, *behold, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own house, and I will take thy wives before thine eyes, and give them unto thy neighbour, and he shall lie with thy wives in the sight of this (e) sun* ; which was accordingly fulfill'd by his own son (f) *Absalom* :

(a) 1 Sam. x. 1. (b) —xvi. 12, 13. (c) 1 King. xi. 38. (d) Page 131. (e) 2 Sam. xii. 11. (f) —xvi. 22.

## 216 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

*salom*: so was the message to *Jeroboam*, *behold I will bring evil upon the house of Jeroboam, and will cut off from Jeroboam him that pisseth against the wall, &c.* — moreover the Lord shall raise him up a King over Israel, who shall cut off the house of (a) *Jeroboam*; which was exactly accomplish'd by *Baasha*, who conspired against his master *Nadab*, the son of *Jeroboam*, and slew him, and smote all the house of *Jeroboam* — according unto the saying of the (b) Lord: and yet the like message was sent afterwards even to *Baasha* himself, *behold, I will take away the posterity of Baasha, and the posterity of his house, and will make thy house like the house of (c) Jeroboam, even for his being like the house of Jeroboam, and because he kill'd (c) him,* (meaning *Nadab*!) which was also fulfill'd by *Zimri*, who conspir'd against his master *Elah*, the son of *Baasha*, and smote him, and — slew all the house of *Baasha* — according to the word of the (e) Lord: all which seem to have imported full as much of a divine authority and commission, as there was in the case of *Jeroboam*; and yet, he must have an unwarrantable assurance (like that of *Calvin*, who, from those words of the prophet *Nathan* to *David* before-cited, inferr'd, that the incest of *Absalom* (f) was the work of God!) if any one shall pretend to say, that either *Absalom*, *Baasha*, or *Zimri* had a divine commission to authorize

(a) 1 Kings xiv. 10, &c. (b) — xv. 27, &c. (c) — xvi. 3.  
 (d) — vers. 7. (e) — vers. 9. (f) *Calv. instit. l. i. c. 18.*  
 cited in the essay for a new translation of the bible, 1727, edit. 2,  
 p. 182.

thorize their respective actions, or that they were any better than traytors, rebels and usurpers. For *Fifthly*, it has been observ'd by very good criticks, that the translations of the bible do 'often make use of expressions, which bring in God 'saying, that he will — do actions which are incompatible with his attribute of (a) holiness': as particularly, in that judgment denounc'd against *David*; where, instead of rendering them as they are before-cited, we are told the more proper (and 'tis certainly the less exceptionable) reading should be, *I will suffer an affliction to rise against thee out of thine own house, and I will suffer thy wives to be taken, &c.* because 'the 'verbs here used, signify only a permission of the 'things spoken of, and not an action: and the 'word which is translated *evil*, signifies an affliction, or misfortune, here and in many other 'places of (b) scripture'; of which they give us a great many clear and unquestionable examples: agreeably to which if we understand the case of *Jeroboam*, (as 'tis plain we must that of *Abfalom* and others before-mention'd,) it will easily make it appear, that there was no more authority for this revolution under *Jeroboam*, than there was for any of the rest. But, be that as it will, 'tis certain, *Sixthly*, that *Jeroboam* himself, and those *vain men the children of* (c) *Belial*, his adherents, had no regard to the divine prediction, or promise (whatever it was,) nor to the will of the

F f

Lord,

(a) Essay for a new translat. of the bible, p. 125. (b) *Ibid.* p. 128. (c) 2 *Chron.* xiii. 7.



Lord, but only to their own mutinous will and ambitious desires, neither had they patience to wait (as I have shewn (a) *David* did,) till it should please God both to give them a commission, and to open a way for the regular execution of it: but the people, without any directions from God, sent and called (b) *Jeroboam* out of *Egypt*, and of their own heads made him King over all (c) *Israel*; and therefore is their action disclaim'd as an usurpation, and they are condemn'd by the Lord, for having set up Kings but not by him, made princes and he knew it (d) not! yea, they are branded by the Holy Ghost with this odious character, that so *Israel* rebelled against the house of *David* unto this (e) day; and thus the voice of the people is prov'd not to have been the voice of God, but this revolution prov'd a rebellion, and consequently not to be drawn into a precedent: for (as it is well observ'd) 'where men have, without a commission, executed even the unalterable will of God, 'they have not been justify'd in so (f) doing'; and particularly in the case before us, 'tho' God, 'in his wise and just providence,—— did overrule this man's ambition, to bring his own designs to pass, in the punishing of *Israel*, by the rent of ten tribes from the rest, yet this was 'no more excuse to his irregular lust after dominion, than the *Jews* might have alledg'd, for 'bringing about what God had before decreed 'in

(a) Pag. 125, 126.

(b) 1 *Kings* xii. 3. and 2 *Chron.* x. 3.(c) 1 *Kings* xii. 20.(d) *Hof.* viii. 4.(e) 1 *Kings* xii. 19.and 2 *Chron.* x. 19.

(f) Dr. Rye's treat. against the Nonjur. vol. ii, p. 634.

‘ in the sufferings of his beloved son, the saviour  
 ‘ of the world ; they nevertheless, by *wicked* (a)  
 ‘ *hands did crucify and slay him* ; and so might Je-  
 ‘ *roboam*, nevertheless, wickedly follow the temp-  
 ‘ tations of his own ambition or (b) *revenge*’.

*Seventhly*, we may observe, that these ten tribes,  
 which thus set up *Jeroboam*, were the very same  
 people who had before set up *Absalom* first, and  
 then *Sheba*, even against *David*, the man after  
 God’s own heart ; and that too upon the very  
 same motives, and in much the same words :  
*we have no part in David, (said Sheba) neither have*  
*we inheritance in the son of Jesse ; every man to*  
*his tents, O (c) Israel ! and so the people under*  
*the conduct of Jeroboam said, what portion have*  
*we in David ? neither have we inheritance in the son*  
*of Jesse ; to your tents, O Israel ; now see to thine*  
*own house, (d) David ! And as these words were*  
*spoken by a man of (e) Belial, in the former case, so*  
*they who spake them are call’d the children of (f)*  
*Belial, in the latter ; and indeed it is hardly to be*  
*imagin’d, that Belial should dictate the one, and*  
*God the other ; much less that God would write*  
*after Belial, and that too in the same words ! and*  
*moreover, as rebellions when repeated against God’s*  
*vicegerents, become thereby the more heinous re-*  
*bellions against God himself, ’tis but just to suppose,*  
*that these tribes having thus rebelliously set up Ab-*  
*salom, Sheba and Jeroboam, were at last given up to*

F f 2

fall

- |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| (a) <i>Acts</i> ii. 23.  | (b) <i>B. Camfield’s</i> <i>Serm.</i> 10 <i>Febr.</i> 1684, p. 12. |
| (c) <i>2 Sam.</i> xx. 1. | (d) <i>1 Kings</i> xii. 16. and <i>2 Chron.</i> x. 16.             |
| (e) <i>2 Sam.</i> xx. 1. | (f) <i>2 Chron.</i> xiii. 7.                                       |

## 220 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

fall by their own devices. *Eighthly*, if we consider the occasion that was taken for this revolt, we shall find it to have been without any just grounds, for 'tis plain, the *Jews*, in *Solomon's* reign, had been the happiest people, in all respects, of any people in the world, if they had but been judges of their own true happiness : and yet we find these ten tribes, with *Jeroboam* at their head, complaining of great grievances, which they pretended to have borne under him, and peremptorily demanding a redress at *Rehoboam's* hands, as the condition (forsooth !) upon which they would be content still to pay that allegiance to which they were bound by the laws both of God and nature. *Thy father* (said they) *made our yoke grievous : now therefore make thou the grievous service of thy father, and his heavy yoke which he put upon us, lighter, and we will serve (a)*  
thee

(a) 1 Kings xii 4. and 2 Chron. x. 4. ' When we look into  
' history, and find this to have been generally the fate of the most  
' mild and gracious princes, it prompts us to reflect — upon  
' the condition of deprav'd human nature; and to consider, whether  
' the cause of more rebellions and convulsions of government has  
' arisen from the mal-administration of princes, or from the pe-  
' tulancy and unreasonableness of the people? [*Moses, David and*  
*Solomon are here instanc'd; none of which could please them!*]  
' — After the meekest and justest, the most pious and victo-  
' rious, the most peaceable, richest, and wisest, whom else of  
' mortal race should we name! But God did once vouchsafe to  
' take the government into his own hands, and to be King him-  
' self: — but they grew weary of his *Theocrasie*, and — re-  
' jected God too from being their King! and would chuse for them-  
' selves! and of all they chose not one prov'd good. — On  
' the other hand, where they are rul'd with a strait rein, and even  
' tyrannically, they commonly speak best of those princes, and  
adorn

*thee*; which a certain gifted preacher before quoted presumes to call a *claim of (a) right!* But the impolitick *King answered the people (b) roughly*, according to what his prerogative authoriz'd him to have done, rather than what was either his interest or inclination to do: and thus *the cause* is said to have been *from the (c) Lord*, inasmuch as he had before decreed to rent those ten tribes from the house of *Solomon*, to which this infatuated prince unadvisedly contributed a plausible occasion; tho' the calumny, tumult, resistance, and other evil means used in this revolt, cannot, without blasphemy, be ascrib'd to God as the author. 'Tis true, ' an extraordinary concurrence of all ' favourable accidents, and particularly the disposing of all men's minds one way ', may be said to be *the Lord's doing*: but then 'tis own'd ' how dangerous and deceitful an argument this ' from providence will ever seem to be'; and therefore, that it is to be *touch'd with (d) caution!* for ' since God may order and dispose what he ' does not approve, and use the wickedness of men ' while he forbids it, the design of the first ' cause

\* adorn their memories. — K. *Charles I.* courted the Fanaticks ' establish'd them in *Scotland*, indulg'd them in *England*, and even ' made himself a sacrifice to them; yet they hate his memory! ' *Q. Elizabeth* prosecuted them with the utmost rigor; made severe laws against them, and put them in full execution; she ' reckon'd them as her worst enemies, even worse than the *French* ' *Spaniards* themselves, and to have been instrumental in the *Spanish* ' invasion! — and yet they pretend to reverence her memory! ' *Gre. Cassandra*, No. i, 1704, p. 30, &c.

(a) *T. Bradbury's* serm. 14 Mar. 1708. (b) 1 *Kings* xii. 13: and 2 *Chron.* x. 13. (c) 1 *Kings* xii. 15. and 2 *Chron.* x. 15. (d) *Dr. Burnet's* serm. 23 Dec. 1688, p. 9.



## 222 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

‘ cause does not excuse the malignity of the (a)  
 ‘ second’. *Nintbly*, *Jeroboam* himself was so far  
 from justifying himself by any pretence of God’s  
 authority, that his whole conduct shews, that he  
 durst not trust to the divine providence to establish  
 him in what, ’tis plain, he was only permitted to  
 possess himself of: yea, he was so far from in-  
 sisting on a divine right to that kingdom, that  
 he fairly owns *Reboboam* still to be *their lord* the  
 King, and himself no better than a rebel and  
 usurper; as will be prov’d in the ensuing section.  
 But, *Lastly*, to bring this whole controversy to  
 a short issue; if *Jeroboam* had no more than a bare  
 permission, for what he did, he can never be  
 justify’d, much less ought he to be imitated in his  
 ungrateful (b) and treasonable revolt from the son  
 and heir of his master and benefactor: or, if  
 those passages before cited must be construed con-  
 trary to all rule and reason) to signify an actual  
 and immediate conveyance of that kingdom to  
 him from God Almighty, then his case is, in that  
 respect also, so particular, as not to be a proper  
 precedent in our days; because ‘ no man, since  
 ‘ *Christ*’s advent, ever had, or can have *the like*  
 ‘ warrant, in the days of the (c) gospel’. In  
 short (as the author last quoted says) ‘ we Chri-  
 ‘ stians may pertinently urge, in this case of  
 ‘ treason and rebellion, what *Christ* alledg’d in  
 ‘ that of offences, *woe to the world because of*  
 ‘ *offences; for offences will come, but woe to them*  
 ‘ *by*

(a) Dr. *South*’s serm. on 1 *Kings* xiii. 33, 34. p. 1. (b) 1 *Kings*  
 xi. 28. (c) *Fenner*’s prerog. of primog. p. 35.

‘ by whom the offence (a) cometh: so here woe to  
 ‘ the world, because of treasons and rebellions;  
 ‘ for treasons and rebellions will happen, as long  
 ‘ as youth are not duly catechized, and men are  
 ‘ not better and more loyally principled; but  
 ‘ woe to those men by whom seditions, treasons,  
 ‘ and rebellions do come; for the divine *Nemesis*  
 ‘ will undoubtedly pursue and overtake them, ei-  
 ‘ ther in this world, or in that to (b) come’.

§ LV. FOR the proof of which, *Their miserable*  
 let us now take a view of the state *state describ’d*  
 of these ten tribes under these Kings *in general.*  
 of their own chusing; that we may judge how  
 much their condition was mended by the change.  
 And here we shall find, that instead of the peace,  
 plenty, honour, and all happiness that is usually  
 enjoy’d by dutiful subjects under a succession of  
 hereditary princes; when the *King is the son of (c)*  
*nobles*, and every succeeding heir can truly say,  
*I am the son of ancient (d) Kings*; when he who  
 ascends the throne as his undoubted right, ‘ by  
 ‘ the appointment of God and nature, can main-  
 ‘ tain his dignity, without those base and ignoble  
 ‘ arts, without those ambitious shifts and contri-  
 ‘ vances, which are the only support of those that  
 ‘ have no right, and as little (e) merit’: (instead  
 of such a state of happiness, I say, we shall  
 find, that) whereas the grievances they had com-  
 plain’d of in *Solomon’s* reign, and were more  
 afraid

(a) *St. Matth. xviii. 7.* (b) *Fenner’s prerog. of primog. p. 36, 37.* (c) *Eccles. x. 17.* (d) *Isai. xix. 11.* (e) *W. God-  
 man’s serm. at Cambr. 24 May, 1660, p. 27.*

## 224 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

afraid of under his son *Reboboam*, were but imaginary (for neither of those Kings appears in scripture to have been a tyrant or oppressor;) no sooner had they in their worldly wisdom, assum'd the liberty, finally to withdraw their due allegiance, to their rightful soveraign, and set up another in his throne, but they found themselves every way miserably deluded; their strength broken, their trade lost, their riches wasted, their honour turn'd into contempt, their peace into a continual state of war and bloodshed, their religion into an abomination, and in short all the happiness that men are capable of in this life, chang'd into its quite contrary, till they became at length a prey to their neighbours (who before had been forc'd to court them,) and were buried in obscurity to the world's end. And indeed it is no wonder, since, ' a general dissoluteness of manners, an impudent boldness in the practice of iniquity, a neglect and contempt of all the duties of religion, the loosning the joints of government by treasons and conspiracies, divided interests and dissentions among the people, confusions and divisions in the church, are as infallible symptoms of a dying state, of the dissolution of a commonwealth, and the funeral of a kingdom, as if a flaming sword had hung over it, or a voice from heaven had revealed its doom: — and how near we ourselves resemble them (*says this learned author,*) I leave you to (a) judge!

§ LVI.

(a) Dr. *Jane's* serm. 11 Apr. 1679, p. 10.

§ LVI. BUT as *Jeroboam* him- And in particu-  
lar under Jero-  
boam and his  
son Nadab.  
self was the most considerable of all  
that sat upon the throne of *Israel*,

after that revolution, and the person also whose popularity was a principal cause of it, let us examine their condition a little more particularly under him, as it is largely set forth in the sacred records, among the acts of *Jeroboam*. In the very beginning of this revolt, we find so little of the spirit of God accompanying them, that when their King *Rehoboam* sent *Adoram* (one of his principal officers) with a commission to expostulate with them, in order to prevent (if possible) the fatal consequences, they were so far from recollecting themselves, and returning to their duty, that, without regard to his person or commission, they *stoned him with stones that he (a) died*; as if they had been the children of him who *was a murderer from the (b) beginning*, rather than children of *Israel*!

And no sooner was *Jeroboam* in possession of the supreme power, but his first study was how to settle himself in it, and to prevent the people from recovering their senses, and therewithal their true allegiance: he knew right well that religion and loyalty are inseparable companions, and that the true religion is so far from being a friend to unjust titles and acquisitions, that it teaches the indispensable necessity of restitution; and therefore, he takes upon him to re-

G g

form

(a) 1 *Kings* xii. 18. and 2 *Chron.* x. 18.  
xviii. 44.

(b) *St. John*



form it according to his own mind His first step was to grant the people a toleration or indulgence, so that they might no longer be oblig'd to that unity and uniformity of worship, which God himself had establish'd, and expressly requir'd of them, in the temple at (a) *Jerusalem*; for 'the Lord, to prevent divisions, had provided so far for uniformity in his worship, that he required a single unity; and that it might be but in one manner, he let it be but in one (b) place': but *Jeroboam* tells them, *it is too much for you to go up to (c) Jerusalem!* However, because he would not be suspected of being a man of less piety, but only would pass for one less bigotted to the strictness of rites and ceremonies, and more careful of their ease than ordinary, he took care to make a shew of religion (such it as was!) and as they had provided themselves of an idol for a King, so he furnish'd them with idols for their Gods; which he plac'd at proper distances, *the one in Beth-el, and the other in (d) Dan*; so that now they were so happy as to have two conventicles for one cathedral, and those at their own doors too, whereas that was more remote! And here, (said he) *behold thy Gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of (e) Egypt!* But would it not tempt us to imagine, that these people must have become meer ideots when they became rebels, (the one as a judgment upon them for the other,)

(a) *Exod.* xxiii. 17. — xxxiv. 23. *Deut.* xvi. 16. and 2 *Chron.* iii. 1. (b) *Dr. Allestr.* serm. vol. i, fol. 232. (c) 1 *Kings* xii. 28. (d) — ver. 29. (e) 1 *Kings* xii. 28.

other,) since they could be persuaded to such a ridiculous worship! they knew these new *Gods* of theirs were indeed but *calves*, tho' *golden ones*! that they were *made* by *Jeroboam* himself, or by his direction! and that, when they offer'd their *oxen* upon those altars, 'the God and the sacrifice were 'out of the same (a) herd'! And yet so monstrously stupid were they, that *the people* (that is, the *great multitude*) *went to worship before* (b) them! which confirms an observation of a learned divine, that 'there is nothing so absurd, but may be obtruded 'upon the vulgar, under the pretence (c) of religion'.

'Tis true, it may be said, they had a precedent for it, in the *altar* which *Aaron* (thro' an inexcusable weakness) had been prevail'd with, by the great importunity of the mutinous people, to *build before* his *molten calf* in the wilderness: but, if they had consider'd, how *hot the wrath of the Lord waxed against the people* for that act, and what an *atonement* (d) it cost them, be-

G g 2

fore

(a) Dr. *South's* serm. 1668, upon 1 *Kings* xiii. 33, 34, p. 39. Where he supposes *Jeroboam* to have 'made such an edict as this; 'I *Jeroboam*, considering the great distance of the temple, and the 'charges that poor people are put to in going thither, as also the 'intolerable burden of paying the first-fruit and tythes to the priest, 'have consider'd of a way that may be more easy, and less burthen. 'some to the people, as also more comfortable to the priests themselves: and therefore strictly enjoyn, that none henceforth presume to repair to the temple at *Jerusalem*; especially since God 'is not tyed to any place or form of worship; as also because 'the devotion of men is apt to be clogged by such ceremonies', &c. (b) 1 *Kings* xii. 30. and 2 *Chron.* xiii. 8. (c) Dr. *South's* serm. as before, p. 42. (d) *Exod.* xxxii. and *Deut.* ix.

fore they could be acquitted of that great sin, it would have been but small encouragement to an imitation of it. However, this shews us, how the frailties and infirmities of good men are oftentimes sought out, to justify or excuse the impieties and immoralities of wicked ones; tho' 'tis certain, that ten thousand precedents are not sufficient to legitimate one act which is either unlawful in itself, or expressly prohibited by the law of God; but in actions which are evil, the imitation is commonly worse than the example: for 'tis a good rule, that ' no example of any person ' whatever is to be followed, unless it be conformable to the precepts of religion: by this ' rule we are to judge of the actions of others, ' as well as our own; and one reason, no doubt, ' why the failings of holy men are so frequently ' related in scripture, is to warn us, not to imitate the best of men in all things, but only in ' such as we are convinc'd they ought to have (a) ' done '.

But besides, how great a sin soever that of *Aaron* was in itself, yet still he being the true high-priest, the people's adhering to him (tho' in an error) may be much more easily excus'd, than those in the case of *Jeroboam* can be justify'd; because here was notorious schism added to the false worship. For *Jeroboam* did not only separate himself and his people from the true worship  
of

(a) Obligat. of acting according to conscience, &c. A farewell serm. 22 Jan. 1715, p. 18.

of God in the temple, and from the only true high-priest, but he set up a mock-priesthood against the one, as he had set up a mock-worship against the other: he *made priests of the lowest of the people, which were not of the sons of (a) Levi,* (and therefore utterly incapable of that (b) office;) — *whosoever would, he consecrated (c) him;* — yea, *whosoever came to consecrate himself with a young bullock and seven rams, the same might be a (d) priest;* which gave occasion to a celebrated preacher to intimate, that *Jeroboam* was an independent, as *Korah* was a (e) presbyterian!

All this might possibly be much applauded by the fawning addressers of this impostor, as high proofs of his *moderation*, and pious care of his people, to prevent their being *priest ridden!* and to ease their tender consciences from *impositions* and ordinances for which they could see no ground in *reason!* But the Holy Ghost gives it the true character, that it *became sin unto the house of Jeroboam, even to cut it off, and to destroy it from off the face of the (f) earth:* and, lest it should be thought only to relate to himself and his proper race, we find a brand of indelible infamy afterwards fasten'd upon *Jeroboam*, that he *sinned, and made Israel to (g) sin!* For as ‘princes, — who  
‘ being

(a) 1 Kings xii. 31. (b) Exod. xxviii. and xxix. Numb. iii. and iv. and Deut. x. 8. — and xxi. 5. (c) 1 Kings xiii. 33. (d) 2 Chron. xiii. 9. (e) Miles Barne's serm. 10 July, 1684, p. 7. (f) 1 Kings xii. 30. — xiii. 34. — xv. 16, (g) — xv. 30, 34 — xvi. 19, 26. — xxii. 52. 2 Kings iii. 3 — x. 29, 31. — xiii. 2, 11. — xiv. 24. — xv. 9, 18, 24, 28. — xxiii. 15.



‘ being themselves vitious, — (turning piety into policy, and religion into reason of state,) not only infect the people by the contagion of an impious example, but are willing the people should be as bad as (a) themselves’: so ’tis obvious to every one’s observation, that the ape-like multitude are proud to become like their leaders, and think it but a due respect to the court-mode, to imitate them in their follies and vices, yea, even in their most detestable sins and monstrous deformities !

Thus *Jeroboam* himself, taking upon him to invade the priest’s office, by *burning (b) incense*, could not long want others among his party forward enough to intrude themselves into the same : their King’s countenance and encouragement was more apt to spur them on to it, than God’s prohibitions were to slacken them : and when they had got the face of a church (how monstrous soever,) the people readily came into it ; nor were they discourag’d even when a prophet came to denounce God’s judgments against them, and prov’d his mission by a (c) miracle. And thus, when this false worship was set up, (tho’ by a rebel and usurper) it must undoubtedly be look’d upon as the religion by law establish’d ; and whoever refus’d to join in it, misrepresented as enemies to their country ! Whereas, in truth, those who did join with them, in such their separation and false worship, did notoriously *follow a multitude to do*

(a) *Dr. Gauden’s* serm. 28. *Febr.* 1659, p. 74.  
xii. 33,—xiii. 1. (c)—vers. 4, &c.

(b) 1 *Kings*

do (a) *evil*; contrary to God's exprefs command, whereby we are taught, that it is not the number of the parties or other advocates, but the truth and juſtice of the cauſe, that is to be regarded: for 'truth is the ſame, and changeth not, 'whether they be few or many that profeſs it; 'and our religion ſtands not in a multitude of 'pretenders, but in a holy doctrine, and a holy 'practice, which all ought to follow, even when 'the moſt do (b) not'. Beſides, if Dr. *Rye's* obſervation be true, (as without doubt it is,) that 'when prayers and praiſes are offer'd up to God 'by a clergyman, as the mouth of the congregation, if he be an open heretic or ſchiſmatic, '—his congregation ſin by joining in communion with him; and when perſons ſin in the 'very act of offering up their prayers, the prayers '—muſt undoubtedly be an (c) abomination': then doubtleſs the ſacrifices offer'd up by *Jero-boam's* mock-prieſts, who were not only hereticks and

(a) *Exod.* xxiii. 2. (b) Dr. *Clagett's* anſw. to ſeveral captious queries, 1688, p. 16. And the reader may find divers other remarkable proofs to the ſame point, collected from *Tilloſon, Stillingfleet, Blackall*, &c. in the notes upon *Maſon's* vindicat. of the Ch. of *Engl.* 1728, fol. 141, 229, 510, 511, 621, &c. (c) Dr. *Rye's* treat. againſt the *Nonjur.* vol. ii, p. 216, 217. who, in an other place, ſpeaks of prayers, thus 'our prayers would really 'diſhonour God, if there were a falſhood in them, and we knew 'it to be a falſhood; or if we pray'd againſt plain right, in expreſs terms, or againſt a prince whom we believed to be right: for the former prayers wou'd ſhew, that we thought we 'could deceive God, and the latter that we thought God would favour injuſtice'. *ibid.* p. 395, 396.

and schismaticks, but open idolaters too, must needs have been an abomination to the Lord.

This the priests of the Lord, and the *Levites*, and all such others as fear'd God, were truly sensible of; as appears by their leaving their possessions, withdrawing from the communion of the schismaticks, and reconciling themselves to the true church and their rightful soveraign. For *the priests and the Levites, that were in all Israel, resorted to him (their King) out of all their coasts: for the Levites left their suburbs, and their possession, and came to Judah and Jerusalem: — and, after them, out of all the tribes of Israel, such as set their hearts to seek the Lord God of Israel came to Jerusalem to sacrifice unto the Lord God of their fathers; so they strengthened the kingdom of Judah, and made Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, strong: and this was the reason, for Jeroboam and his sons had (by pretended state-acts, depriv'd and) cast them off from executing the priest's office unto the Lord, and ordained him priests for the high places, and for the devils, and for the calves which he had (a) made!* which was a formal act of schism, and that 'the  
' most dangerous condition in the world; for it  
' is to be out of the way to heaven, and in the  
' high road to (b) hell!

Thus

(a) 2 Chron. xi 13, &c. And how our orthodox bishops and clergy and their flocks acted, under the like trials, in times of popery and schism, may be seen at large in the preface to the late edition of *Mason* before-quoted, fol. xxiv, lxix, &c. (b) Dr. Rye's treat. against the *Nonjur.* vol. i, p. 1, 2.

Thus sin is usually seconded with sin: and as *Jeroboam* had committed the sin of rebellion to gratify his own ambition, his ungodly policy led him of course to commit that of schism, in hopes thereby the better to secure himself in his usurpation; for 'those sins of schism and rebellion' are never better defended than by one (a) another'. And, as the natural consequence thereof, his own private views oblig'd him to persecute the true priests and *Levites* and their adherents, as enemies to his title and proceedings; and would not suffer him to discover any repentance (if he had still had the grace to repent,) when a man of God came out of Judah, expressly to proclaim the word of the Lord against him: but the same prophane hand, with which he was offering burnt incense, was presently stretch'd forth from the altar, with a direction to his followers to lay bold on the (b) prophet, in order to punish him for his message, if the Lord, who sent him, had not miraculously rescued him from the tyrant, and manifested the truth of his own word. Then indeed he could speak him fair, offering him refreshment and a reward for restoring his wither'd hand: but so little are the Lord's people to have to do with rebels and schismaticks, that he utterly refus'd to accept of any favours from him, and plainly told him, *if thou wilt give me half thine house, I will not go in with thee, neither will I eat bread nor*

H h drink

(a) *L. Milb. legacy to the church*, 1722, vol. i, p. 23. (b) *1 Kings* xiii. 1, &c.



*drink water in this place; for so was it charged me by the word of the (a) Lord.*

And that they were no less disappointed of their proposed happiness in civil affairs, than they were in religious, may be fairly concluded from these following observations. *First*, that 'tis the usual method of divine providence, in punishing irregular princes or people, to make use of the greatest tyrants and most hardened sinners, to be firebrands of his wrath, that by means of their cruel and merciless oppression, his people might the sooner be reduced to a sense of their duty: thus, he suffer'd certain of the very worst of the heathen nations to remain among them, in the land of promise, as thorns in their sides, *that through them he might prove Israel, whether they would keep the way of the (b) Lord*; thus *David*, for his sins, was punished by his most unnatural, ungrateful and rebellious son (c) *Abshalom*; thus the idolatrous house of *Abab* was destroy'd and rooted out by *Jehu*, an (d) idolater, and *Hazael* a monster of a (e) man; and thus the idolatry of *Solomon* was punish'd by *Jeroboam*, whose idolatrous wickedness was notorious even to a proverb. But, *secondly*, we may observe, as before, what a zealous stickler he had been for the people's liberty, and the redress of grievances, under their natural sovereign, thereby the more to insinuate himself into their favour, as a great patriot and asserter of the

(a) 1 Kings xiii. 6, &c. (b) Judg. ii. 3, 22. (c) See page 131, &c. (d) 1 Kings xix. 15, &c. 2 Kings x. 29. (e) VIII. 12.

the publick good: and yet, no sooner was his own turn serv'd, and the whole power in his hands, but we find him *building* (a) cities, and places of strength to fortify himself with gar-  
risons and magazines; which could not be done without heavy taxes, and large supplies of men and money; and which would not have been requir'd, if the whole kingdom had been united, as before, under its own proper head. ' Thus what-  
' ever the pretences are, how fair and popular  
' soever, in the opposition men make to authority,  
' ambition and private discontents are the true be-  
' ginners of them: but these must be covered  
' over with the deepest dissimulation, with most  
' vehement protestations to the contrary; nothing  
' must be talked of, but a mighty zeal for re-  
' ligious and the publick interest:—— But, if  
' fair pretences, and glorious titles will serve to  
' cheat the people into their own miseries, and  
' the sad effects of rebellion, they shall never want  
' those who will enslave them for the sake of li-  
' berty, undo them for the publick good, and  
' destroy them with designs of reformation. For  
' nothing is more popular than rebellion in the  
' beginning, nothing less in the issue of it: and  
' the only true reason that it is ever so, is from  
' the want of wisdom and judgment in the ge-  
' nerality of mankind, who seldom see to the  
' end of things, and hardly distinguish between  
' the names and nature of them, till their own

H h 2

' dear-

(a) 1 Kings xii. 25.

## 236 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

‘ dear-bought experience hath taught them the  
‘ difference (a) ’.

This was fully verify’d in the case now before us: for whatever fair speeches and declarations *Y-roboam* made publickly to the people, he *said in his heart, now shall the kingdom return to the house of David: if this people go up to do sacrifice in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, then shall the heart of this people turn again unto their Lord, even unto Rehoboam, King of Judah, and they shall kill me, and go again to Rehoboam, King of (b) Judah.* Where, by the way, we may discover, not only the true grounds of this usurper’s politicks, but also how conscious he was of his unwarrantable revolt; so that he could not but in his own heart acknowledge the

(a) *Stillingfl.* *Serm.* 30 *Jan.* 1668, p. 14, 15. ‘Tis wisely remark’d by Sir Philip Warwick (in his memoirs, p. 51, 52.) that when *ship-money* was laid upon the whole kingdom, in the reign of King Charles I. according to a solemn judgment pronounc’d in favour of it, the whole sum amounted not to 20000 *l.* a month; which ‘ fell very short of what the future charges amounted unto, in maintaining a rebellion against his Majesty, upon pretence of these grievances: ——— and they that made this so grievous, soon after thought it not amiss, because it was to maintain their own sedition, to lay ten times more upon every subject than he paid before’. *Ibid.* p. 63. Another tells us of the *Dutch*, that ‘ having fought with the King of Spain about two things, religion and taxes, they have so far prevail’d in respect of both, that they have gotten all the religions in *Christendom*, and pay the greatest taxes in the world’. Dr. *Edw. Pelling’s* *Serm.* 30 *Jan.* 1681, p. 24. And, in general, it is the common observation of travellers abroad, that *they seldom read liberty writ over the gate; but entering the city, they find slavery within*; so little are people sensible of that wherein true liberty consists till they have lost it!

(b) 1 *Kings* xiii. 26, 27.

the right of *Reboboam*, (that he was *their Lord* still, notwithstanding himself was in possession of the kingdom of *Israel*, with the full consent of the people thereof,) and the capital punishment which himself deserv'd, and might justly expect, to be kill'd, for his rebellion and usurpation! A plain evidence this, that *Reboboam* had not lost his title to the ten tribes by that revolution! that possession, and the *people's* consent or *recognition*, is no sufficient title to the throne, in such hereditary countries, especially (as Mr. *Whiston* suggests,) in barr to (a) *primogeniture*! and in short, that the people themselves are commonly disappointed, when they presume to break through natural rights, and the fundamental laws of succession, (as well in kingdoms as families) upon such fallacious grounds as the supposed *personal virtue, goodness, and desert* of their favourite! For as the worthless *bramble* is observ'd to be the most (b) aspiring, so 'tis certainly the most apt to scratch and tear those who come into its power. • Wherefore it's but a seasonable caution, that men • beware of giving into principles which tend to • shut *God* out from the government of the • world: for suppose subjects, taking the sword • and the cause into their own hands, should lay • about them so successfully, as to free themselves • from under the *scourge*, he will certainly change • it into the chastisement of the *scorpion*; and the • little

(a) *Whist. script. polit.* p. 30. (b) See *Jotham's* parable, in p. 89.



## 238 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

‘ *little finger* of providence will be thicker upon  
 ‘ them, than the *loins* of the very prince of  
 ‘ whom they complain. Many of you, I know,  
 ‘ must be sensible, that I could give a very de-  
 ‘ plorable evidence of this truth, by tracing from  
 ‘ point to point the conduct of providence  
 ‘ towards (a) ourselves’: — but the nature of  
 the case is so evident as not to need particular  
 proofs. For ‘ an usurper brings along with him  
 ‘ a necessity of renouncing all humanity, and  
 ‘ religion too: he must hate all those whom he  
 ‘ hath injured, and must punish whatsoever his  
 ‘ own guilty fears present, as if they were ma-  
 ‘ nifest crimes: he must tolerate all manner of  
 ‘ disorder and confusion in the worship of heaven,  
 ‘ for the sake of those which himself hath brought  
 ‘ upon the affairs of earth: he must give up the  
 ‘ word of God to mercenary tongues and unhal-  
 ‘ low’d hands, to be tenter’d, and set upon the rack  
 ‘ till, with the heathen oracles of old, it can  
 ‘ φιλιππιζεν, cant something in the favour of his  
 ‘ pretensions. And who can be so vain, as even  
 ‘ to dream of property or liberty under such a  
 ‘ state? who can hope for the enjoyment of a  
 ‘ rightful possession, whilst the government itself  
 ‘ is but a splendid (b) robbery’? But, now to  
 go on.

Tho’ the Lord did not think fit to suffer King  
*Rehoboam* to reduce these revolted *Israelites* to his  
 obe-

(a) Mr. D’Oyly’s serm. at Bath, 17 Sept. 1710, p. 25. (b)  
 Nat. Alsop’s serm. at Leicester, 23 Mar. 1681, p. 13, 14.

obedience, yet he gave them into the hands of *Abijah*, his son and heir, who, with an *army of four hundred thousand*, (in a most exemplary manner) defeated *Jeroboam's* army of *eight hundred (a) thousand*, killing *five hundred thousand* of them on the spot: which, being the most complete and remarkable victory that we read of in the whole bible, was surely something more than a bare *(b) deliverance*, (as Mr. *Whiston* calls it;) for it was a most wonderful and signal appearance of providence, (if he will allow that providence ever appears on the right side!) in favour of hereditary right, against possession by popular election. And this, Mr. *Whiston* could not but have clearly distinguish'd, if he had perus'd it *impartially* (as he pretends;) for the text is not, that *God deliver'd Judah out of the hand of Israel*, but *God delivered Israel into the hand of Judah*: neither did the usurper die without some remarkable judgment from God; for the text says, *the Lord struck (c) him*.

Here I must beg my reader's patience, whilst I give him an abstract of this chapter, which contains so solemn an appeal to, and signal interposition and appearance of the Lord himself, in favour of the right heir of the house of *David*.

When the battle was set in array, *Abijah* stood up, and addressing himself to the usurper *Jeroboam*, and to all his army, said, *Ought ye not to know; that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom*  
over

(a) 2 Chron. xiii. 3, 17. (b) *Whist. script polit.* p. 36. (c) 2 Chron. xiii. 20.

## 240 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

over Israel to David for ever, even to him and to his sons by a covenant of (a) salt? yet Jeroboam — is risen up, and hath rebelled against his Lord! and there are gathered unto him vain men, the children of Belial! and have strengthened themselves against Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, when Rehoboam was young (b) and tender-hearted, and could not withstand them! And now ye think to withstand the kingdom of the Lord in the hand of the sons of David: and ye be a great multitude, and there are with you golden calves, which Jeroboam made you for Gods! Have ye not cast out the priests of the Lord — and have made you priests after the manner of the nations? — But as for us, the Lord is our God, and we have not forsaken him; and the priests which minister unto the Lord, are the sons of Aaron, — for we keep the charge of the Lord our God, but ye have forsaken him! And behold, God himself is with us for our captain, and his priests with sounding trumpets, to cry alarm against you! O children of Israel, fight ye not against the Lord God of your fathers, for ye shall not (c) prosper!

In which speech, 'tis observable, that Abijah insists positively, that the Lord had given the kingdom of Israel to David and to his heirs for ever, in due course of succession; and that such his divine hereditary right thereto, was by a covenant (or ordinance, or institution) never to be alter'd

(a) That is, by a perpetual, sacred and inviolable covenant; for salt drives away corruption, and therefore is the emblem of durability. (b) This must be understood of his want of capacity, rather than of age. (c) 2 Chron. xiii. 3, &c.

alter'd, that is to say, indefeasible: he charges *Jeroboam* with rebellion against his Lord, and withstanding the kingdom of the Lord in the hand of the sons of *David*; and finally assures them, that in fighting against him, they *fought against the Lord God*, and therefore should not prosper. All which would have been very improper and impertinent for him to have mention'd, especially in so solemn and publick an appeal (and *Jeroboam*, or his party, might easily have objected it to him, as such) if the hereditary right to the throne had not been notoriously known and allow'd to be indefeasible, or if *Abijah* himself had not been the right heir of the house of *David*, as I have (a) prov'd him to have been.

I might likewise have observ'd, how he upbraids the usurper with casting out the priests of the Lord under pretence of his lay-deprivations, and intruding others into their offices by state-acts, and imposing a new state-religion upon the multitude, &c. But I shall wave the further consideration of these particulars, at present.

However, this speech of his had no effect upon the audience. For *Jeroboam* (who trusted not in God, but in his own strength and policy, as usurpers usually do) *caused an ambushment to come about behind them — And when Judah looked back, behold, the battle was before and behind; and they cried unto the Lord, And — God smote Jeroboam and all Israel, before Abijah and Judah, — and*

I i

God



## 242 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

*God delivered them into their hand:—— neither did Jeroboam recover strength again in the days of Abijah; and the Lord struck him, and he (a) died.*

Thus have we seen this kingdom of *Israel*, tho' much larger in territories, and fuller of people, than that of *Judah*, reduc'd to a very low and weak condition, at that time, by reason of their revolt, and as the natural consequence of their being rebels with relation to their King, schismatics to the church, and apostates to God! In which miserable state they subsisted, under nineteen Kings (so called,) of nine several families; most of which came to violent ends, and not one of them was tolerably furnish'd with *personal virtue, goodness or desert*, (tho' severally set up by the people themselves) but all of them, to a man, branded with this character, that they *sinned and made Israel to sin!* whom I shall now proceed to give my reader a more particular view of.

*Jeroboam* held the throne *two and twenty (b) years*, tho' he cannot with any propriety be said to have had a settlement in it, when there was a right heir asserting his pretension to it: however, after his death, *Nadab his son reigned in his (c) stead*; the beginning of whose reign was contemporary with *the second year of Aza King of (d) Judah*. But he was scarce warm in the throne, when

### § LVII.

(b) 2 Chron. xiii. 13, &c. (b) 1 Kings. xiv. 20. (c) Ibid.  
(d) — xv. 25.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION. 243

§ LVII. BAASHA conspired against him, and smote him, — and reigned in his Baasha and Elah.

(a) *stead*: which he did out of his own wicked ambition only, without any commission, tho' he thereby became the instrument of *destroying all the house of Jeroboam, according unto the saying of the* (b) *Lord*. — His mounting the throne was in the *third year of Afa*; and there was war between them all their (c) *days*: yet, after *'twenty and four years* he died, and Elah his son reigned in his *stead*, in the *twenty and sixth year of* (d) *Afa*. But it was not long before he was dispatch'd the same way as Nadab had been by his father: for

§ LVIII. ZIMRI (*captain of half his chariots*) conspired against him, — and Zimri. killed him, in the *twenty and seventh year of Afa, King of Judah, and reigned in his* (e) *stead*; — and destroyed all the house of Baasha, according to the word of the (f) *Lord*: and yet Zimri, having had no commission to execute the judgment denounc'd against the house of Baasha, was so far from being justify'd, that it became a proverbial saying, by way of interrogation, implying a strong negative, *had Zimri peace who slew his* (g) *master*? No! he had no peace, but was soon rewarded according to his desert: for,

§ LIX. No sooner was it known, Omri, Ahab, Ahaziah, and Jehoram. that he had assum'd the sovereignty, but all Israel made Omri, the captain

I i 2

(a) 1 Kings xiv. 27, &c. (b) — vers. 29. and xiv. 10, &c. (c) — xv. 32, 33. (d) — xvi. 6, 8. (e) — vers. 9, 10, 15. (f) — vers. 2, &c. (g) Kings ix. 31. of

## 244 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

*of the host, King over (a) Israel; and besieg'd Zimri in Tirzah; where, after a reign of seven days, he burnt the King's house over him with fire, and (b) died, to avoid falling into the hands of his enemies. And here Mr. Whiston himself calls Zimri an usurper; but only so 'because he had no consent of the body of the (c) people'! As if the body of the people of Israel had sufficient authority to make Omri a King, any more than Zimri was one! which I challenge him to shew good grounds for in the word of God. But whereas he says, 'the sacred history does not ever suppose such titles as this of Omri's to be invalid, that I can find throughout the whole (d) bible'; I would recommend to his more serious consideration that text before quoted, so Israel rebelled against the house of David unto this (e) day. It is not enough for him to come off with that explanation, as he does, in the case of Baasha, where he says, 'I mean, where no law of God had interposed, and where therefore the election of the people was ever esteem'd, so far as I can find, a sufficient title to the (f) crown'. For that phrase, unto this day, will extend to Omri as well as to Baasha, and to both of these, as properly as to Jeroboam himself: for all these rebell'd against the house of David, by their heading the revolted tribes. The bible says, they rebelled, and lets us know wherein it consisted; not in any defect of the people's*

(a) 1 Kings xvi. 16. (b) —vers. 17, 18. (c) Whist. script. polit. p. 38. (d) Ibid. (e) 1 Kings xii. 19. and 2 Chron x. 19. (f) Whist. script. polit. p. 35.

people's choice or consent, but in their opposition to the right heir of *David*: nay, the sacred history assures us, that both *Jeroboam* and *Omri* were the people's own choice, and Mr. *Whiston* affirms the same of *Baasha* (a) too; and yet they are all charg'd with rebellion against the house of *David*, as much as *Zimri* is, which one would think is more than a bare *supposal*, that such titles are *invalid*. If not, I would gladly know what Mr. *Whiston* means by calling *Baasha's* title (b) *irregular*? Surely, there must then be some standing rule which it did not square with: but he had the people's voice, and his title 'seems to be fully 'acknowledg'd for a good one by God (c) himself', (according to Mr. *Whiston's* construction of the text (d) referr'd to;) therefore it can be nothing but the want of the hereditary right that could make such a title irregular. As this is clearly my own notion of it, I cannot but impute it to the irresistible force of truth, that it has dropp'd from his pen. For, if either the *election of the people* was a *sufficient title* in general, or it had been *fully acknowledg'd for a good one by God himself* in that particular case, no man of learning or religion would have presum'd to call it *irregular*: but since the sufficiency of the popular title is but a groundless fancy, and that particular text cannot fairly amount to any more than God's permission only, (as I have already (e) demonstrated it cannot,) the difficulty is unravell'd

(a) *Whist. script. polit.* p. 35. (b) *Ibid.* (c) *Ibid.*  
(d) 1 *Kings* xvi. 1, 2. (e) *Pag.* 216.



## 246 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

ravell'd, so that Mr. *Whiston* might call such titles irregular, without any absurdity.

But, to return to *Omri*; so precarious a thing is a title founded on the voice of the people, that, no sooner was *Zimri* destroy'd, but *then were the people of Israel divided into two parts; half — followed Tibni, — to make him King* (tho' all Israel had made *Omri* King but a few days before) and half followed *Omri*. Upon which division (for the publick good to be sure!) there inevitably ensu'd a civil war: but the people that followed *Omri* prevail'd; — so *Tibni* died, and *Omri* reigned, in the thirty and one year of (a) *Asa*.

And now, by this conquest, together with his original title of the people's choice, *Omri* might seem to have what they call a providential settlement in the throne, which he held twelve years, and was succeeded, at his death, by *Abab*, his son in the thirty and eight year of (b) *Asa*: and *Abab*, after a reign of twenty and two years, dying in battle, was succeeded by *Abaziah*, his son, in the seventeenth year of *Jehosaphat*, King of (c) *Judah*; which *Abaziah*, dying soon after, was succeeded by his brother *Jehoram*, in the eighteenth year of *Jehosaphat*, King of *Judah*, and reigned twelve (d) years.

(a) 1 *Kings* xvi. 21, &c. (b) — 28, 29. These chronological notices may be of some use, to inform the less learned reader which of the Kings of *Judah* these were severally cotemporary with: but if any will be critical, and make remarks upon the chronology as not exact, let him know, the fault is not mine; I have quoted my authority for it, and as such shall submit it to the proper censors. (c) 1 *Kings* xvi. 29. — xxii. 40, 51. (d) 2 *Kings* i. 17. — iii. 1.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION. 247

years. And the reason of his succession is particularly recorded, *because Ahaziah had no (a) son*; so that *Jehoram* was then his natural heir: which is a further proof of the generally receiv'd notion of the right of proximity of blood, according to the law of (b) *inheritance*; inasmuch as we may learn from hence, that whatever family was in the throne, still the succession was look'd upon by all the adherents as due to him that was next of kin of that line. But however, so far was that providential right (as they call it,) or the prescription of eight and forty years possession, from securing the establishment of the house of *Omri*, that *Jehu*, by express commission from God, destroy'd that whole house and kindred; as will be prov'd in the following section.

But, before I leave this, it is to be observ'd of that very populous kingdom of *Israel*, (which in *Jeroboam's* time had afforded an army of *eight hundred thousand* fighting men at once, and therefore may be reasonably suppos'd to contain several millions of souls in the whole,) that they were so far alienated from God, notwithstanding all their wonted zeal for circumcision and other *Mosaical* ordinances, that, even in *Abab's* time, (not much more than half a century after their revolt,)

- ' what through the indigence of the clergy, who,
- ' being of the meanest of the people, were thrust
- ' into the priest's office, as such who would make
- ' undue compliances for a piece of silver, or a

' morfel

(a) 2 Kings i. 17.

(b) Numb. xxvii. 11.

## 248 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

‘ morsel of (a) bread; what through the covetous-  
 ‘ ness of the laity, who had consciences large  
 ‘ enough to swallow all such riches or honours  
 ‘ as were the rewards of a time-serving profes-  
 ‘ sion, they ran in almost all of them so uncon-  
 ‘ trollably into the worship of *Baal*, that fashi-  
 ‘ onable and lucrative idolatry, — that there  
 ‘ were but *seven thousand left*, that had *not bowed*  
 ‘ *their knees to (b) Baal*’; and those too so scatter’d  
 and dispers’d, that they did not know one ano-  
 ther; much less had they any opportunities of  
 correspondence or publick worship. Thus were  
 the multitude wholly *influenc’d by the court-religion*;  
 which ‘ they thought (as too commonly it hap-  
 ‘ pens) the readiest way to get preferment and  
 ‘ become rich by: and they preferr’d this to all  
 ‘ other (c) considerations’, not excepting even  
 those of schism and idolatry; whereas the truth  
 was with those few, who, like *Elijah*, were per-  
 secuted *into the (d) wilderness*: ‘ but men that are  
 ‘ sincere in any religion, do hate and abhor such  
 ‘ hypocritical dissemblers, and despise and spue  
 ‘ them out, for their nauseous lukewarmness; and  
 ‘ as men indeed of no religion or conscience,  
 ‘ but for what serves to their present (e) ends’.

Agreeable to which was the conduct of *Elisba*  
 the prophet towards *Jehoram*, when he *went down*  
 together with *Jehosaphat*, to *enquire of the Lord*  
 by

(a) 1 Sam. ii. 36. (b) Stubb's serm. 4 Octo. 1702, p. 7,  
 in 4to. (c) J. Walker's serm. 23 Apr. 1710. p. 3. (d)  
 1 Kings xix. (e) Stillingfl. serm. 13 Novem. 1687, p. 29.

by him. *What have I to do with thee (said Elifha) ? Get thee to the Prophets of thy father, and to the prophets of thy mother —* (meaning the false prophets, who hardned him in his schism, and countenanc'd him in his idolatry ; declaring to him, *As the Lord of hosts liveth, before whom I stand, surely, were it not that I regard the presence of Jehoshaphat, the King of Judah, I would not look toward thee, nor see (a) thee.* So much was the respect, which the prophet paid to a lawful and orthodox prince, different from his behaviour to a schismatick and usurper !

Another remarkable occurrence happens here also within the same period of time ; which has occasion'd various mistaken constructions. *Naaman, the King of Syria's General and great favourite, was a (b) leper ;* and, having heard of the miracles done by *Elifha*, came to that prophet, who effected his cure. Upon which *Naaman* makes a solemn declaration before *Elifha*, saying, *Behold, now I know, that there is no God in all the earth but in Israel ; — thy servant will henceforth offer neither burnt offering nor sacrifice unto other Gods, but unto the Lord : in this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaneth on my hand, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon ; when I bow down myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing. And he said unto him, go in (b) peace.*

K k

Which

(a) 2 Kings iii. 11, &c.  
vers. 15. &c.

(b) — v. 1.

(c) —



## 250 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

Which words have inclin'd many people to think, that they may justify their compliance with (or at least their presence at) superstitious or immoral worship by this example: whereas, if they were translated with respect to the time past, and not to the time to come, (as several learned men acknowledge the original will well bear,) the difficulty would be remov'd, the objection answer'd, and all reconcil'd to a consistency with the attributes of God, as well as to that purity and simplicity which is requir'd of us in divine worship. Thus (we are told) *Luther's German bible*, printed at *Weimars*, with notes, hath well render'd it, *In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that when my master went into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaned on my hand, I bowed myself in the house of Rimmon; the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing, that I bowed myself in the house of Rimmon, (a) &c.* In which version the penitent is only made to beg God's pardon for his former sin, and not a dispensation for repeating it: the former of which the prophet might well give him an assurance of, but not of the latter; neither indeed would the latter have been so consistent with the convert's own foregoing declaration as the former is.

Jehu, Jehoahaz,  
Joash, Jeroboam,  
Zachariah.

§ LX. BUT now let us proceed to *Jehu*, who slew *Jehoram*, and all that remained of the house of (b) *Ahab*;

(a) Essay for a new translat. of the bible, 1727, p. 215.  
(b) 2 Kings ix. 24. — x. 11.

## *the* REGAL SUCCESSION. 251

Ahab ; according to the word of the Lord by the prophet (a) *Elijah*. But here it is to be observ'd, that *Jebu* was made *King* himself before he attempted this upon his master : not by the voice of the people (for they were never consulted) but by a prophet of the Lord ; who calling him apart from his company, *anointed* him, and gave him an exprefs commission and command, to *smite the house of* (b) Ahab : in virtue of which *Jebu* thought himself sufficiently authoriz'd (as undoubtedly he was) to take it upon him, without so much as asking the people for their consent afterwards. And yet this very person, so immediately rais'd up by God, was himself a notorious (c) idolater : so that I would gladly know, what a modern divine meant, when he said, ' God ' would not suffer idolatrous princes to rule over ' his people ; and why should (d) we ' ? Especially, when he affirms, in the same page, that ' a divine example is — set down for our imitation, and therefore not to imitate it, would ' be (e) sin '. It plainly appears, in many examples, that *God did suffer*, and in this particularly, that he did actually raise up an *idolatrous prince to rule over his people* ! What inference this author would draw from such a *divine example*, I leave to himself to declare : 'tis enough for me to conclude, that dominion is not founded in grace, but in nature. However, *Jebu* having executed his

K k 2

com-

(a) 1 *Kings* xxi. 21. 22. (b) 2 *Kings* ix. 1, &c. (c) — x. 29, 31. (d) *Blakeway's* serm. in Nov. 1715, p. 5, (e) *Ibid.*

## 252 The SHORT HISTORY of

commission to the full, he had a promise from the Lord, that his children of the fourth generation should sit on the throne of (a) Israel. Thus, after he had reigned twenty and eight years, he was succeeded by Jehoabaz his son, in the three and twentieth year of Joash, King of (b) Judah: and he, after seventeen years, by Joash his son, in the thirty and seventh year of Joash, King of (c) Judah, and he, after sixteen years, by Jeroboam his son, in the fifteenth year of Amaziah, King of (d) Judah: and he, after forty and one years, by Zachariah, his son, in the thirty and eighth year of Azariah, (or Uzziab) King of (e) Judah, in whom the line of Jebu ended.

§ LXI. FOR, no sooner was the Shallum. promised term expir'd, but Shallum conspired against Zachariah, when he had reign'd but six months; and smote him before the people, and slew him and reigned in his stead, in the nine and thirtieth year of the same (f) Uzziab.

Menahem,  
Pekaniah. § LXII. BUT, when he had play'd the King a full month, he was paid in his own coin by Menabem, who smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead ten (g) years: and when he died Pekebiab his son reigned in his stead, in the fiftieth year of the same King of (h) Judah.

### § LXIII.

(a) 2 Kings x. 30. (b) — vers. 35, 36. — xiii. 1.  
(c) — vers. 1, 9, 10. (d) — vers. 10, 13. —  
xiv. 16, 23. (e) — vers. 23, 29. — xv. 8. (f) —  
vers. 8, 10, 13. (g) — vers. 13, 14, 17. (h) —  
vers. 22, 23.

§ LXIII. BUT, as his father had <sup>Pekah.</sup> got the throne by violence, so did he also lose it, after *two years* possession: for *Pekah*, one of his captains, *conspired against him, and smote him, — and reigned in his room, in the two and fiftieth year of the same King of (a) Judah.*

§ LXIV. NOR had he himself any better fate, tho' he kept the possession *twenty years*: for *Hoshea* made the like *conspiracy against him, and smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead, in the twelfth year of Ahaz, King of (b) Judah.*

From all which we may gather this general observation, ' that he that has once dar'd to violate  
' the majesty of Kings, hath seldom found all the  
' hands that he could join together, sufficient to  
' uphold an usurped throne; and hath taught  
' others to bear no more respect to himself than  
' he hath shewed; and given them, besides, a  
' pretence to dispossess him for unjustly invading  
' another's right: which being once taken away,  
' and power become the rule of justice, there  
' have often risen up a sort of men pretending  
' to it, who never failed to give one another their  
' deserved (c) punishment '. Neither are the petty shifts and mean artifices less remarkable, which these several usurpers were forc'd to make use of in their respective difficulties: sometimes giving vast sums of money to a powerful neighbour, to *guaranty* their ill-gotten possessions,  
or

(a) 2 Kings xv. 23, 25, 27. (b) — vers. 27, 30. — xvii. 1. (c) Galtwyke's serm. 26 July, 1685, p. 17.



## 254 The SHORT HISTORY of

or (as our translation renders it) *to confirm the kingdom in their (a) band!* Sometimes dearly buying a little present peace of one, and at the same time basely endeavouring to make contrary alliances, to enable them to break (b) it! And whatever their end was in the disposal of it, still the money was (c) exacted of the deluded people, to their impoverishment; for these quack-methods were so far from curing the wound, that they both made it deeper and increas'd the smart: their neighbours became still stronger and more imposing, while they themselves grew daily weaker and less able either to gratify or deny whatever they demanded; till at last *Shalmanezzer*, King of *Affyria*, like an insatiable gulph, exhausted all at once, carrying away *Hoshea* and all his people into captivity, and overflowing the country with an inundation of foreigners, who *knew not the God of the (d) land!*

Thus have I gone through the whole history of the Kings of *Judab* and *Israel* with due care and impartiality, ending with their respective captivity: out of which (as is before observ'd) the former did return, tho' not as a proper and independent kingdom; but the latter were totally lost, insomuch that all we now hear of in any part of the world are descended from the loyal tribe of *Judab*. And now, to sum up the whole again, I beg leave to remind the reader, that tho' the succession of those in *Israel*, was not regular,

(a) 2 Kings xv. 19. (b) — xvii. 3, 4. (c) — xv. 20. (d) — xvii, 6, 24, &c. — xviii. 9, &c.

gular, as that of the Kings of *Judab* was, yet, even there, the law of inheritances was still so much regarded, that whoever obtain'd the crown, and left it in peace, was always succeeded by his son, or other next heir, according to the law of nature, as he will perceive by the particulars before set forth: and that, of all the several revolutions among them, there is not one justified, except that of *Jebu* only; nor that any otherwise than because he had an express warrant from the Lord, for what he did, and was himself a King before he made any attempt upon his master. But, as for the rest, tho' God Almighty doth oftentimes raise up (or rather permit) certain rebels to be his instruments of wrath to punish irregular princes (as it is his sole prerogative to do, he not being bound to those laws which he prescribeth to others); yet, unless they have an express warrant from him, as *Jebu* had, they are but rebels still. And therefore, it follows, (as an author before quoted well observes) that 'it is  
' treason for any subjects, upon the specious pre-  
' tence of executing God's decree and vengeance,  
' to raise war, make sedition, to depose and kill  
' their lawful prince (a) '!

§ LXV. AND now (though I am not oblig'd to it by my present undertaking) I shall just cast my eye abroad in the world: wherein, that the same regard was had to this hereditary descent, by proximity of blood,

*Some hints  
from other  
nations.*

(a) *Jenner's* prerog. of primogen. p. 35.

## 256 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

blood, even universally among the nations also, we may gather, from these few evidences following.

When *Abimelech*, King of *Gerar*, desired *Abraham* to enter into a covenant with him, *swear unto me* (says he,)—*that thou wilt not deal falsely with me, nor with my son, nor with my son's (a) son.*—

The kingdom of *Pharaoh* in *Egypt*, which *Mr. Whiston* supposes not to be any way discoverable in (b) scripture, was certainly hereditary, as we find, we read, that the Lord smote all the first-born—from the first-born of *Pharaoh*, that sat on his (c) throne, &c. or (as it is in some translations) that was to sit on his throne: and again, where it is said, in the person of *Pharaoh*, *I am the son of antient (d) Kings*. To which we may add, what is well observ'd by our judicious countryman, to put the matter out of all controversy. 'The crown royal  
' (says he) always passed by descent, and not by  
' election: which (besides consent of authors) the  
' scriptures also prove. For, whereas *Joseph*  
' bought all the land of *Egypt* for *Pharaoh*, if the  
' crown had passed by election, then should *Pharaoh's*  
' children hereby either have been en-  
' thrall'd among the rest of the people, to the  
' next successor, or enjoying their father's land,  
' tho' not his estate (or royal dignity,) have been  
' more mighty than the King, as landlords of all  
' *Egypt*, and the King himself their (e) tenant'.

When

(a) *Genes.* xxi. 23. (b) *Whist.* script. polit. p. 14. (c)  
*Exod.* xii. 29. (d) *Isa.* xix. 11. (e) *Raleigh's hist.* fol. 200.

## the REGAL SUCCESSION. 257

When *Nabash*, the King of the children of Ammon, died, Hanun his son reigned in his (a) stead.

In the answer, which the King of Tyre return'd to Solomon's message, he tells him, he has sent him workmen of Hiram his (b) father; which shews that he was his father's heir in that kingdom.

When the King of Moab sacrificed his eldest son, it is written, that he took his eldest son that should have reigned in his (c) stead, or (as *Josephus* expresses it) who ought in right to succeed him in the (d) kingdom; 'where the eldest son seems to be in course supposed the (e) successor'.

By *Belsazzar's* inheriting his father (f) *Nebuchadnezzar's* kingdom, we may perceive it was the rule in that country also: which is further confirm'd by that of the prophet *Jeremy*, all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's (b) son.

From which hints (and several others in the holy scriptures), we may conclude the general extent of the law of hereditary succession: but, as that may be more amply made appear from other authors, this may suffice here.

### L 1

### APPEN.

(a) 2 Sam. x. 1. and 1 Chron. xix. 1. (b) 2 Chron. ii. 13. (c) 2 Kings iii. 27. (d) Antiq. Jud. l. ix. c. i. (e) *Whist.* script. polit. p. 37. But it was the King of Edom's son, and not his own, whom he thus sacrificed: as seems clear from the prophet, (*Amos* ii. 1.) who calls him the King of Edom, because he had that kingdom in his view in right of primogeniture; as the learned Archbishop *Usher* observes, in his sermon in the Isle of Wight, 1648, p. 10, in 4to. (f) Dan. v. 2. (g) *Jerem.* xxvii. 7.





## APPENDIX.



S to the *Cæsars* (or *Roman* emperors) that is, the *higher powers*, to whom our blessed Saviour and his Apostles, have taught us to *submit* our selves, their particular titles are not to be ascertain'd from the holy scriptures: but as it is very proper to know somewhat thereof, for the better understanding the nature and extent of that duty of subjection, the following extract has been made, with all due brevity, from authors of undoubted credit.

But, to obviate all objections, as if (according to the foregoing history,) in order to entitle these *Roman* emperors to the obedience of their subjects, for conscience sake, I ought first to prove every one of them to have had a strict hereditary right to the throne, I find it necessary to premise, that, tho' *conquest*, in itself, is 'but a false gloss, put 'on the worst and blackest of crimes, injustice, 'robbery, and cruelty (a)', and therefore can give no prince any better title to a crown, than an highway-man has to any purse he can catch: yet, 'tis agreed, by all casuists, that power, how-  
soever

(a) Bp. Burnet's serm. 31 Decem. 1706.

soever unlawfully obtain'd, may be legitimated, and commence authority, either by exprefs revelation from God Almighty, as that of *Saul*, *David*, and *Solomon* did, or by the utter extinction and failure of all those who have a prior right, like that of *Abaziah* (a) abovementioned, or else by the submission, and disclaimer of them to whom the crown of right belongs: in any of which cases, 'tis agreed, the possessor becomes authoriz'd, and entitled to the allegiance of his subjects, by what means soever he became possessor of the power; because he then requires nothing of them, but what is in their own power, and they are at liberty to pay him, without doing wrong to any third person: for that is the great objection against submission to powers *de facto*, so long as there are any others claiming, *de jure*.

Now, to apply this to the case before us. It is not deny'd, but that, when our Saviour appeared in the flesh, *the sceptre was departed from Judah*; and the *Jews* were become subjects to the *Romans*, by the dedition or submission of (b)

L 1 2

*Hircanus*:

(a) Pag. 186. (b) Bishop Burnet (preaching on our Saviour's command, *to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's*;) observes, that 'about an hundred years before this time, two brothers, of the posterity of the *Maccabees*, quarelled about the kingdom: and the younger brother, *Aristobulus*, being too hard for his elder brother, *Hircanus*, he, — claimed the protection of the *Romans*. — Upon that *Pompey* came, and took *Jerusalem*: but, instead of restoring *Hircanus*, which

## 260 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

*Hircanus*: but the controversy is, whether the emperors then reigning (to whom the subjection was commanded in the gospel) were lawful emperors? or whether the subjection was due to them as to the powers for the time in being, without any respect had to the legality or illegality of their titles?

This being the question, we must observe, that *Augustus* was upon the throne when our Saviour was born: and therefore we must enquire into his title, as well as those of *Tiberius*, *Caligula*, *Claudius* and *Nero*; who are all that come within the compass of this controversy. And all these were lawful

‘ in justice he ought to have done, he—reduced *Judæa* unto  
 ‘ the form of a province. From that time the *Romans*——  
 ‘ treated the nation as subject to them’. (Bp. *Burn.* serm. 29  
*May*, 1710, p. 3, 4.) And he repeats it again, ‘ certainly *Pom-*  
 ‘ *pey* ought to have restored *Hircanus* to his right, according  
 ‘ to the alliance that the *Romans* had made with his ancestors’.  
 But as he has stated the case, it appears, that the *Romans* had the  
*Jews* in subjection by right of conquest, and that in ‘ a war  
 ‘ begun upon just and lawful grounds: and (as he himself had  
 ‘ affirmed on another occasion,) it is the uncontroverted opinion  
 ‘ of all lawyers, that the success of a just war gives a lawful  
 ‘ title to that which is acquired in the progress of it’. (Past. let-  
 ter, 1689, p. 20.) And had he taken notice, that *Hircanus* was  
 ‘ a quiet indolent man, who——had no ambition for reigning’.  
 (*Prid. connect.* vol. ii. par. ii. b. vi.) he could not have wonder’d  
 at *Pompey*’s not restoring him. However, it seems, the right  
 of primogeniture, even in Bishop *Burnet*’s opinion, was so  
 sacred, that in justice it ought not to have been defeated: and it  
 is certain, that the dissention, occasion’d by the interruption  
 thereof, ‘ was the cause of the *Jews* loss of sovereignty and  
 ‘ liberty, which the *Romans* never before of themselves at-  
 tempted’. *Howell*’s hist. bib. vol. ii, p. 284, edit. 2, in 8vo

lawful emperors; as in the following extract will be made appear.

For (not to insist here upon the manner of acquiring it, which indeed was by resistance and rebellion, as all other popular states and commonwealths began) the supreme power was vested in the senate of *Rome*, as representatives of the people; and that, without any claim or pretension kept up by their Kings, or any other competition to the contrary: so that they were then possessors of the government, in the same manner as our neighbours, the *Dutch*, have been, ever since the Kings of *Spain* dropp'd their claim of sovereignty over them. I say, the supreme power was thus in the senate, without any competition, when *Julius Cæsar*, having overcome *Pompey*, made himself absolute master of the liberties of *Rome*: but the senate, and people, who before had it in their own hands, having immediately made him a compliment thereof for his life, that act of theirs gave him a good right and authority to what he had before in his power; so that he was undoubtedly their lawful sovereign from thenceforwards, without any competition, so long as he liv'd, and was obey'd by them as such. Nor was that all: for he was received with the greatest joy imaginable, and invested with such honours and power, as they had never before conferr'd on any. In short, they made him *all that was great*, and never thought they had enough to bestow upon him; till he, beginning to exercise the power they had given him, was assassinated,



## 262 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

nated, in the senate-house, under pretence of the publick good, and restoring the *liberty of the subject*; and that too, by a sett of conspirators, who were all under the greatest personal obligations to him.

But ‘publick good, reformation of abuses, and  
 ‘zeal for religion, are ever pretended, and as  
 ‘constantly invaded, in the course of such proceedings, till at last, the well-meaning, that for  
 ‘the sake of these were drawn in to assist, find  
 ‘themselves cheated out of them all (a)’. Thus the people, soon finding themselves disappointed of the advantages which the conspirators had flatter’d them withal, began to mutiny, and burn their houses (as they deserv’d); which gave *Octavius Augustus* a fair opportunity to ingratiate himself with the *Senate* and people, by pursuing the regicides to death. After which, and his victory over his competitors, he so wrought upon the *Senate*, that they besought him earnestly to take the empire upon himself alone. Whereby all the authority of the *Senate* and people being freely and voluntarily transferr’d and confirm’d to *Augustus*, by their own act, the imperial power thenceforwards became a legal constitution, and was indeed thoroughly settled and establish’d in him; as is acknowledged, by bishop *Stillingfleet* (b), as well as by all other writers. Besides, so forward were they, in investing him with the  
*supreme*

(a) Bp. *Chandl.* serm. 30 Jan. 1717, p. 27.  
 reaf. of new separat. 1689, p. 39.

(b) *Un-*

supreme power, that as the same learned author observes from *Dio*, they offer'd to bind their allegiance to him by oaths: which, however, he wisely refus'd, for this reason; ' he considered  
' well, that if they gave their free consent, they  
' would do what they promis'd without swearing,  
' and if they did not, all the oaths in the world  
' would not make (a) them'.

Thus was he confessedly a lawful sovereign, in obedience to whose decree, *Joseph* and *Mary* (then big with child) went up to *Jerusalem*, to be taxed (b); and in whose time our blessed Saviour chose to appear in the flesh.

*Augustus* dying, *Tiberius* (whom he had adopted, and made his partner in the empire) was left with the power in his hand, and without any rival, (no *Pretender* appearing to put in a claim against him): so that the *Romans*, of all degrees, crowded, to shew their forwardness to subject themselves to (b) him. And, after many earnest entreaties on the one part, and feign'd refusals on the other, he was at length, as it were compell'd, or forced, with some seeming reluctancy, to take the government upon him, as a man does a burthen upon his shoulders, meerly to oblige the (d) people.

Thus was this *Emperor* in the throne, during all the time of our Saviour's preaching. And, as he had all the right that was then requir'd, accord-

(a) *Ununreaf. of new feпарат. 1689, p. 40.* (b) *St. Luke ii. 1.* (c) *Tacit. ann. l. i. Romæ ruere in fervitium confules, patres, equites.* (d) *Quafi coactus. Sueton. p. 24.*

## 264 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

according to the (a) constitution of that empire: so was that right confirm'd to him by our Saviour himself, who was the *natural born King of the* (b) Jews, and whose pedigree is deriv'd in a direct line of hereditary descent, from *Abraham*, by St. *Matthew* (c), and from *Adam* by St. *Luke* (d). For, when the question was put to him, concerning the *payment of tribute to Cæsar* (e), he did not only determine it in favour of *Cæsar*, as a duty (f) to him; but likewise, to make it still more exemplary, he wrought a miracle to pay the same for himself: and when the people would have

(a) Great pains is taken, to draw a parallel between the constitution of the *Roman* empire, and that of other kingdoms, where the succession is undoubtedly hereditary; and thereupon to insinuate, that the Emperor here treated of was no better than a meer usurper, *the right heir* being then *known*: (Bp. Burnet. past. lett. 1689. p. 10.) Whereas 'tis certain, there was then no such pretender as a *right heir*; as the reader may be fully convinc'd, by Dr. *Hickes*, in his *Jovian*, 1683, p. 5, &c. (b) St. *Matt.* ii. 2. (c) — chap. i. (d) St. *Luke* iii. (e) St. *Matt.* xxii. 17, &c. and St. *Mark* xii. 13, &c. (f) His answer was only in general, *render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's*; which was not properly a determination, what was *Cæsar's*: but only a command to *restore every man his own*: for as the question was put to him with a premeditated design to take advantage against him from his own words, so was his answer guarded with caution to avoid the snare. But, to say, that because *the Roman coin was then current among them*, *Cæsar's image and superscription* upon it was, of itself, a sufficient proof of his being entitl'd to their allegiance, (as some people argue upon occasion,) is as absurd, as to infer *Oliver's* right to our allegiance, from his *breeches-money*, which was current here among us for some time, even (I believe) after our rightful sovereign's restoration!

have taken him *by force to make him a King, he departed into a mountain himself (a) alone*. Nor did he only thus waive his claim, and submit himself to *Cæsar*, but he declar'd also, that his *kingdom was not of this world: If my kingdom were of this world (said he,) then would my servants fight (b)*; expressing thereby the great duty indispensibly incumbent upon all subjects, in general, to assist and fight for their natural sovereign, whenever his service requires it. So far was he from authorizing, what Mr. *Whiston* dreams of, *the duty of subjects to leave their King (c) unassisted*, when invaded! For what a late divine said of *Englishmen*, is equally true, of all subjects, that they are all 'born subjects to their lawful prince: 'and tho' they have never taken any oath of 'allegiance to him, they are as much liable, — 'as if they had been under the obligation of 'a thousand solemn oaths and promises (d)'. And that 'the subjects or servants of all lawful 'princes are obliged, by the very nature of 'government, and the agreement of all mankind, to endeavour, by the force of arms, if 'otherwise they cannot, to rescue and defend 'their sovereigns, from any injuries offered them 'by any of their enemies (e)'.

But as, in this particular case, our blessed Saviour did not make any claim of his right: so

**M m**

neither

(a) St. John vi. 15. (b) — xviii. 36. (c) *Whist.*  
*seript. polit. dedic.* p. iv. (d) *Milbourne's serm.* 30 Jan.  
 1707, p. 5. (e) — 30 Jan. 1715, p. 3.



## 266 The SHORT HISTORY of

neither would he suffer his followers to resist the civil power which himself had authoriz'd, tho', at that very instant, it was imploy'd on a most wicked design (even no less than the death of the Saviour of the world,) but sharply reprov'd *Peter's* unwarrantable zeal; declaring that *all they that take* (assume, or usurp) *the sword, shall perish with the (a) sword*. And, to shew that it was not for want of sufficient power to defend himself, he adds, *Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of (b) angels?* that is, a force more than enough to have routed both the *Jews* and *Romans*: but (as *St. Peter* himself afterwards declares,) our blessed Saviour *suffered for an example to us, that we should follow his steps; who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who, when he was reviled, reviled not again, when he suffered, he threatned not, but committed himself to him that judgeth (c) righteously*. All which the inspired apostle applies to our *suffering wrongfully and patiently*; as part of our portion or (d) *calling*: and tis plain, the *fulfilling* the work of our redemption could not be the sole consideration of *Christ's* not resisting, because that would have been no *example* to us, who cannot possibly *follow his steps* in that respect.

This consideration alone, one would think, might be sufficient to *stop the mouths of gainsayers*,  
and

(a) *St. Matt.* xxvi. 52. (b) — *vers.* 53. (c) 1 *Pet.* ii. 21, &c. (d) — *vers.* 18; &c.

and to condemn the senseless and wicked comments of those modern interpreters, who falsely pretend, that the *followers* of this divine example in the primitive ages, did *patiently suffer*, only for want of power to resist, and not for *conscience sake*! (which a late learned person truly calls *an intolerable reproach to (a) Christianity*;) and who industriously insinuate, that, under the general words, whereby our obedience is injoin'd, there are certain *exceptions imply'd*, of cases of *necessity*, (of which the people themselves, or any mutinous party of them, are to be the judges, when they lawfully may (yea, and are in duty bound to) resist authority, for the security of religion, or what any prevailing party (b) is pleas'd to call so. But, whoever they be, that propagate *principles, that encourage rebellion and treasonable practices*, 'with which  
' too many corrupt and spurious *Protestants* have  
' declared themselves to be infected, to the great  
' scandal of our holy religion,——they are not  
' *Protestants* in imbibing them; nay, they are *Papists* in so doing, for 'tis very well known, they  
' at least originally received them from their (c)  
' books'. 'Tis certain, ' never cause of religion

M m 2

' was

(a) *Stillingsf. serm. 7 Mar. 1678, p. 50.* Who there also, speaking of the propagators of such fallacious notions, says, 'we are sure, whose disciples soever they pretend to be, they are none of *Christ's*!' *ibid. p. 52.* (b) Thus the heathen *Bulgarians* took arms against their King, *because he was converted to the Christian religion*; (as *Zonaras* tells us, tom. iii.) and so may the wildest offspring of heresy do upon the same specious pretence of conscience and religion. (c) *Dr. Fowler's disc. of offences, 1683, p. 11, 19.*

## 268 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

' was of so great concern, as the preserving the  
 ' head and author of (a) it ' ; and therefore the  
 conduct of our blessed Saviour, in his own case,  
 ' doth so expressly discharge all busling and fight-  
 ' ing, on the pretence of religion, that we must  
 ' either set up for another gospel, or utterly re-  
 ' ject what is so formally condemned by the au-  
 ' thor of this we profess to (b) believe ' : for  
 whether *St. Peter* be consider'd as a *Bishop* or a  
*Presbyter*, at that time, ' this command, to put  
 ' up his sword, equally concerns him in all capa-  
 ' cities ; and ought to secure sovereign princes  
 ' from the unjust usurpations and treacherous con-  
 ' spiracies both of *Geneva* and (c) *Rome* '. But  
 I shall close this point with a just conclusion of  
 a great man now living, drawn from this very  
 case, that ' if neither the malice of the *Jews*, nor  
 ' the innocence of our Lord ; if neither the truth  
 ' of our religion, persecuted in its founder, nor  
 ' the apparent marks of malice and envy, of vio-  
 ' lence and oppression, which appeared in the  
 ' whole course of their prosecution of him, were  
 ' sufficient to warrant *St. Peter* to draw the sword  
 ' in his defence, against that legal authority by  
 ' which they acted ; we must conclude, that nei-  
 ' ther will any of these pretences suffice to justify  
 ' any other *Christians*, in the like circumstances  
 ' now : but if it shall please God, at any time, to  
 ' permit the lawful powers to be against us, and  
 ' make them that hate us to rule over us, we  
 must

(a) *Dr. Burn. serm. 6 Dec. 1674, p. 41.* (b) *Ibid.*  
 (c) *Dr. Sherl. case of resist. p. 63.*

‘ must follow the example of our blessed Master,  
 ‘ and submit patiently to their authority; and  
 ‘ not, with this warm apostle, *take the sword* against  
 ‘ those, to whom God has committed the power  
 ‘ of the sword *a)*’. And this he very properly  
 calls the *true Christian doctrine of submission* (or, in  
 other words, passive obedience and non-resistance)  
*to the civil magistrate*. For, this our blessed Sa-  
 viour himself taught us, when he patiently sub-  
 mitted himself to die by the judgment of *Pilate*  
 (who acted by the lawful emperor’s commission,) *acknowledging,* that *his power was given him from*  
*above (b)*. ‘ The blessed apostles followed their  
 Master’s *steps*, in this as in all other things, and  
 ‘ counted it their glory to be conformable to  
 ‘ him in his sufferings. — And, as long as  
 ‘ Christianity continu’d pure and unallay’d, this  
 ‘ doctrine gave proofs of its reality, by the un-  
 ‘ exampled patience and sufferings of the *Christi-*  
 ‘ *ans*, in a succession of three ages, and ten *(c)*  
 ‘ persecutions ’! Out of due regard to them  
 therefore, we might have expected softer terms  
 than those of a *slavish principle!* a *bloody doctrine!*  
*the doctrine of the bow-string!* &c. which have been  
 borrow’d from the infamous *life of Julian the*  
*apostate*, by certain persons, who would persuade  
 us,

(a) Bp. Wake’s serm. 30 Jan. 1707, p. 11, in 8vo. (b)  
 St. John xix. 11. (c) Dr. Burnet’s serm. 6 Decem. 1674,  
 p. 41, &c. edit. 1710, in 8vo. where ’tis observ’d, that, in one  
 of these persecutions, and in the province of *Egypt* alone, there  
 were no fewer than 8 or 9,000,000 of *martyrs*; and yet *no tu-*  
 were rais’d against all this tyranny and injustice.



## 270 *The SHORT HISTORY of*

us, that this doctrine ' is inconsistent with the law  
 ' of reason, with the law of nature, and with the  
 ' practice of all ages and countries, — first in-  
 ' vented to support arbitrary and despotick power ;  
 ' —tending to enslave a free nation, to foment  
 ' divisions and parties', &c. But ' indeed in an  
 ' age, when some are bold enough, ( because  
 ' with impunity they dare) to attack our Saviour's  
 ' divinity, what respect do we think they can pay  
 ' to his (a) doctrine '? However, notwithstanding  
 all the scoffs and railings of *Rabshakeb*, ' there  
 ' are three ways of proving and confirming the  
 ' doctrine of non-resistance, or subjection to so-  
 ' vereign princes; 1. By the testimonies of the  
 ' holy scriptures; 2. By the doctrine and practice  
 ' of the primitive *Christians*; 3. By the fundamen-  
 ' tal constitutions of that particular government  
 ' under which we (b) live '. So that Dr. *Burnet*  
 might truly make this reflection, that, ' among  
 ' all the heresies this age has spawn'd, there is  
 ' not one more contrary to the whole design of  
 ' religion, and more destructive of mankind,  
 ' than that bloody opinion of defending religion  
 ' by arms, and forcible resistance upon the colour  
 ' of preserving religion: the wisdom of this po-  
 ' licy is *earthly, sensual and devilish*; favouring  
 ' of a carnal, unmortify'd and impatient mind,  
 ' that cannot bear the cross, nor trust the pro-  
 ' vidence of (c) God'.

That

(a) Justice done to the sacred text, &c. A serm. 12 May, 1717, by G. C. A. M. p. 20. (b) Dr. *Sherl.* case of resist. p. 2. (c) Pref. to vind. of the church and state of *Scotland*, 1673.

That the *Jews* paid submission to the *Roman* emperor, as a duty to their lawful sovereign, we may gather from the rage or fury wherewith they prosecuted our Saviour as an *enemy* to *Cæsar*. When they brought him before *Pilate*, they accused him with *perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to (a) Cæsar!* When *Pilate* shew'd an inclination to release him, they cry'd out, *If thou let this man go thou art not Cæsar's (b) friend!* And again, when he said unto them, *shall I crucify your King?* the *chief priests* answer'd, *we have no King but (c) Cæsar;* thereby expressly affirming, that *Cæsar* was their lawful sovereign, without any competitor.

Such was the right of *Tiberius*, by whose authority our blessed Saviour was put to death. But I can't leave it without this remark, relating to the resistance of that authority, that, as *Peter* (from whom the Pope pretends to claim his supremacy) was the person resisting, so the person wounded and miraculously heal'd again, was call'd *(d) Malchus* (which in the original signifies a *King*;) not without a mystery, to shew us the *unlawfulness* of that unchristian doctrine of killing and deposing lawful kings, so much contended for by some of the *worst of papists*, and from them taken up by the *worst of those who call themselves (e) Protestants!*

After

(a) *St. Luke* xxiii. 2. (b) *St. John* xix. 12. (c) —  
 vers. 15. (d) *St. Luke* xxii. 51. and *St. John* xviii. 10.  
 (e) See a large catalogue of the like principles, adopted by the *Puritans*,

After *Tiberius's* death, *Caligula* (who was the people's darling for his father's sake) by the joint consent of the senate and people, was declar'd emperor, and the whole sovereign power (a) lodg'd in his hands : but, being in a short time slain by some of the disappointed people, he was succeeded by a riotous anarchy (as is common in all elective kingdoms,) till *Claudius* was found out, and rais'd to the throne, by common consent. And he, having adopted *Nero*, his succession was easily accomplish'd after *Claudius's* death.

During all which successions, there is not indeed the least footstep of a lineal hereditary descent in the *Roman* empire, but the succession to the imperial throne was elective, casual, uncertain, and arbitrary : and whosoever obtain'd the sovereign power by the consent of the senate and people, was the undoubted lawful sovereign, according to the constitution of the *Roman* empire. Because (as I said before) there was, after that, no such thing as a competition for the throne, nor any pre-tender

*ritans*, out of the writings of *Jesuits*, and other known *Papists*, in Dr. *Hickes's* serm. 30 Jan. 1681, p. 17, &c. And whoever is curious to observe the harmony (both in principle and practice,) between those two parties, notwithstanding their pretended opposition, may find ample proof of it in Archbishop *Bancroft's* book, entitled *Dangerous positions and proceedings* (several times reprinted ;) Mr. *Dav. Owen's* *Herod and Pilate reconciled*, &c. 1610. Dr. *Heylin's* history of the *Presbyterians*, 1672. Mr. *Hen. Foulis's* hist. of the plots, &c. of our pretended *Saints*, 1674. Mr. *Ware's* foxes and firebrands, 1682. Mr. *Tho. Long's* hist. of the same conspiracies, 1684. and many more.

(a) *Sueton.* p. 14.

tender to a better title : and, I believe, 'tis agreed on all sides, that possession howsoever obtain'd, must be presum'd to be rightful, until a better title (a) appears. So that, in a word, I shall make no doubt of all the above-named emperors being lawfully possess'd of the sovereign power, at least, till I am inform'd who were better intitled thereto, and whether such better title was kept up, and asserted, in opposition to the possessor ; that is (as we commonly express it now-a-days, whether there were princes *de jure*, pretending to, or claiming the throne, against those who were only, *de facto*, in possession of it.

The learned Mr. *Locke* (whose principles have the authority of a gospel with some of our adversaries,) lays it down as a certain rule, that *there is no usurpation, but where one is got into the possession of what another has right (b) to*. From whence we must infer, that, tho' possession, in itself alone, is no bar to a real and proper right, when asserted and prov'd, but the unjust possessor is bound in law and conscience to make restitution to the right owner : yet, when no body

N n is

(a) A late ingenious writer illustrates this by a very familiar example. ' Suppose (says he) I should rob you of your hat. This does not give me a right against you : but it gives me such a right to it, that if another should rob me of that hat, it would be robbery in him ; and, tho' he should prove, at his tryal, that I had robb'd you of that hat, it would be no justification of him, because he could shew no right that he had to it '. (*Leslie's*) rehearf. vol. i. n. 66. (b) *Locke's* two treatis. of governm. b. ii. ch. xvii. of usurpation, p. 8. 41



## 274 *The* SHORT HISTORY *of*

is injur'd, (as it is to be taken for granted, where no *pretender* asserts any right,) possession supposes a right; and as such is to be regarded, as well in relation to government, as to private property. And, this being the case, I cannot see any conclusions to be fairly drawn, (however artfully they have been attempted,) from *St. Paul's behaviour towards the civil magistrate*, in favour of the darling doctrine of resistance; nor any inconsistency between the apostle's practice and his precept: unless his appeal from an inferior magistrate, (who was *willing to do the Jews a pleasure*, by giving him up to their mercy,) to *Cæsar* (a) himself, who was the undisputed supreme, can with any good sense be call'd a resistance of the *higher powers* to whom he had commanded *every soul to be subject for conscience (b) sake!*

Divers other fallacies might here be pertinently expos'd, amongst our modern expositions (or perversions) of this apostolical precept: but, to avoid being more tedious, I shall only recommend the following observations to the memory of every ingenuous reader. When we consider the qualities of that *Cæsar*, to whom *St. Paul* so strictly injoin'd a *subjection* under pain of *damnation*, and to whom he *appeal'd*, as the *dernier resort*, in his own case, we may be sure, it was all out of regard to his authority, as being the lawful *higher power*, or supreme governour, and as such the *minister of God*; and not with respect to his *personal*

(a) *Acts* xxv. 11.

(b) *Rom* xiii.

nal virtue, goodness and desert: for Nero (in whose reign this happen'd, as *Chronologers* generally agree) was not only a *Heathen*, and violent persecutor of the true religion, but even a monster in morality; so that, as his *dominion* cannot truly be said to have been founded in *grace*, neither can his want of *grace* to answer (what some people affect to call) the end of this institution, be said to amount to a forfeiture of his right to his subjects obedience, without openly flying in the face of the inspir'd apostle! And again, when we meet with others gravely, and dogmatically, pronouncing, that 'when St. Paul writ to the *Christians* of Rome, 'he is express in this, that they should not trouble themselves with inquiries into titles, but 'should take things as they found (a) them', &c. we ought to remember, that he is more express in this, that we are to render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom (b), &c. according to that of our blessed Saviour himself, render unto Cæsar the things which are (c) Cæsar's, &c. But how shall we know what things are Cæsar's due, unless we are satisfy'd of his title to them? And in case of a controversy about such

N n 2

title,

(a) Bp. Burnet's past. lett. 1689, p. 12. And 'tis remarkable among many other self-contradictions, that this same author, afterwards insinuated, that St. Paul's doctrine against resistance was meant only to the *Jews*; tho' here he owns it written to the *Christians* of Rome. As if St. Paul had been mistaken in the direction of his epistle! Or a *Christian* prelate had a dispensation to speak notorious untruths, in favour of occasional conformity! (b) Rom. xiii. 7. (c) St. Matth. xxii. 21.

title, how shall we know which of the competitors to pay tribute, and swear allegiance to, if we are *not to trouble ourselves with inquiries*, in order to satisfy our consciences (as such solemn acts require,) which has the best right to them? For, 'if they claim that which is not *theirs*, — we are not bound to pay or *render* that, since it is not at all (a) *theirs*'. Surely, such *weather-cock-divinity* (as one (b) merrily calls it) was not known in the apostle's days, unless it be understood among those *things*, which, he says, were *taught by deceivers for filthy lucre's* (c) *sake*!

But how St. Paul would have behav'd himself towards an usurper, (properly so call'd) if there had been such a one in power in his days, we are left to guess, from the word by which the Holy Ghost inspir'd him to distinguish *the higher powers*, to whom he commanded us to *be subject*. For αἱ ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑΙ, (which he there, and every where else, makes choice of, for that purpose) being deriv'd from ἐξουσιᾶ, *licet*, (which signifies to be *lawful*,) does always, and only denote *lawful power*, or (d) *authority*: whereas ΔΥΝΑΜΕΙΣ, from

(a) Bp. Burn. serm. 29 May, 1710, p. 4. (b) S. Johnson.

(c) Tit. i. 10, 11. (d) For the truth of this I might vouch Bp. Ward, Bp. Hopkins, and many more learned men: but the common school-distinction, that ἐξουσιᾶ properly signifies the moral faculty, and δύναμις the *natural*, may be sufficient to shew, that the former always supposes a right. And therefore I could wish, that our *English* reader would always distinguish between *authority* and *power*, by the instance of *Oliver*, who had the one, while the other was in King *Charles*, nevertheless for his being in exile, attainted and abjured.

from *δύναμις*, *possum*, (which signifies to be *able*) would have denoted any kind of *power*, in general, which a man is able to possess himself of, if the apostle's meaning had not been to determine it to the moral faculty only ; and certainly, it would be a blasphemous presumption to insinuate, that the *Holy Ghost* (by whose inspiration these precepts were written,) has not made use of a word proper for his own meaning. So that Dr. *Sherlock's* notion, that *where God has placed and settled the power, it is a certain sign to us, that he has given the (a) authority*, is groundless and unwarrantable, and contrary to all the principles of scripture, law, and right reason ; unless by *settling* we understand such a settlement, as supposes an extinction or disclaimer of all other pretenders : for, otherwise, *Absalom*, *Athaliah*, *Cromwell* or *Massanello*, must have had that *certain sign of God's authority* ; which this author himself durst not venture to allow them, *while there was a natural prince in (b) being*.

Here I might farther pursue the inquiry into what is call'd *Christian liberty*, and shew that the gospel has made no alteration as to the rights of Kings and duty of subjects, nor given any greater encouragement to faction and sedition than the law did : for (to use the words of a learned *Civilian*)  
 ‘ the current of the antient fathers is in this point  
 ‘ concurrent ; insomuch as, among them all, there  
 ‘ is

(a) *Sherl.* case of alleg. 1690, p. 15. (b) — case of resist. 1684, p. 128. See the notes also upon *Mason's vindicat.* of our church, 1728, fol. 235, and 265.



## 278 *The* SHORT HISTORY of

‘ is not one found, not any one, (one is a small number, and yet I say confidently again, there is not any one) who hath let fall so loose a speech, as may be strained to a contrary (a) sense’. But I shall close the whole with this observation, from an eminent divine, that the *Christian* doctrine is so far from warranting the *frivolous evasions and ridiculous distinctions* of those who, in spite of *Christianity*, have pleaded for the resistance of authority under the old pretence of zeal for religion and liberty, ‘ that what God then declared to be displeasing to him, by such remarkable judgments, hath been now more fully manifested, by frequent precepts, and vehement exhortations, by the most weighty arguments, and the constant practice of the first and the best of *Christians*, and by the black character which is set upon those, who, under a pretence of *Christian liberty*, did despise dominion, and speak evil of (b) dignities, and follow *Corah* in his rebellion, however they may please themselves with greater light than former ages had in this matter, they are said to be such for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for (c) ever’!

And now, I have faithfully and honestly endeavoured to discharge my duty, as I promis’d at the beginning of this undertaking: and if any thing herein is of use towards settling the minds of my readers, in matters of so great and universal concern,

(a) Sir J. Hayward’s answer to Doleman, 1603, p. 47. (b) St. Jude 11, 13. (c) Dr. Stillingfleet, serm. 30 Jan. 1668, p. 39.

cern, I have my end; and shall add no more, but this declaration, that I am as free from prejudice as any man living, and therefore shall readily acknowledge and correct any mistakes or oversights which I may have happen'd to be guilty of in this Short History, upon due notice and conviction, and be thankful for better information; hoping in the mean time, that the candid reader will be as ready to pardon as I am to retract them.

F I N I S.



# ADVERTISEMENT

*Lately publish'd.*

A Vindication of the Church of *England*, and of the lawful Ministry thereof; that is to say, of the Succession, Election, Confirmation and Consecration of *Bishops*; as also, of the Ordination of *Priests* and *Deacons*, in five Books: Wherein the Church of *England* is defended against the Calumnies and Reproaches of *Bellarmino* — and other *Romanists*, &c. Written by FRANCIS MASON, B. D. — And now Translated from the Authors Latin Edition, much enlarg'd and corrected. Whereunto is added a *Sermon* of the same author's, concerning the Authority of the Church; an exact Copy of the first Reform'd *Ordinal* in 1549; and a Translation of some *Fragments of Letters* written (from *Lambeth*) to Father *Le Courayer*, in an APPENDIX; together with a complete INDEX, and Marginal NOTES upon the whole Book. To all which is prefix'd, a full and particular Series of the *Succession of our Bishops*, through the several Reigns since the Reformation, in distinct *Tables*; an Historical Account of this *Controversy*, and of the several *Writers* on both sides; and particularly of our learned Author, *Mason*, and of all his Works, in a large PREFACE, by JOHN LINDSAY.

N. B. — *laudatur & alget!*



